arXiv:1611.10348v2 [math.ST] 4 Dec 2016

Inference for the mode of a log-concave density

Charles R. Doss* **and Jon A. Wellner†**

School of Statistics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
e-mail: cdoss@stat.umn.edu
url: http://users.stat.umn.edu/~cdoss/

Department of Statistics, Box 354322
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-4322
e-mail: jaw@stat.washington.edu
url: http://www.stat.washington.edu/jaw/

Abstract: We study a likelihood ratio test for the location of the mode of a log-concave density. Our test is based on comparison of the log-likelihoods corresponding to the unconstrained maximum likelihood estimator of a log-concave density and the constrained maximum likelihood estimator where the constraint is that the mode of the density is fixed, say at m. The constrained estimation problem is studied in detail in the companion paper, Doss and Wellner (2016b). Here the results of that paper are used to show that, under the null hypothesis (and strict curvature of $-\log f$ at the mode), the likelihood ratio statistic is asymptotically pivotal: that is, it converges in distribution to a limiting distribution which is free of nuisance parameters, thus playing the role of the χ^2_1 distribution in classical parametric statistical problems. By inverting this family of tests we obtain new (likelihood ratio based) confidence intervals for the mode of a log-concave density f. These new intervals do not depend on any smoothing parameters. We study the new confidence intervals via Monte Carlo methods and illustrate them with two real data sets. The new intervals seem to have several advantages over existing procedures. Software implementing the test and confidence intervals is available in the R package `logcondens.mode`.

AMS 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62G07; secondary 62G15, 62G10, 62G20.
Keywords and phrases: mode, empirical processes, likelihood ratio, pivot, convex optimization, log-concave, shape constraints.

*Supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-1104832 and a University of Minnesota Grant-In-Aid grant.
†Supported in part by NSF Grants DMS-1104832 and DMS-1566514, and NI-AID grant 2R01 AI291968-04

Contents

1 Introduction and overview: inference for the mode . . . 3
2 The white noise problem and limit processes . . . 6
2.1 Unconstrained white noise problem . . . 6
2.2 Constrained white noise problem . . . 7
3 Local asymptotic distribution theory near the mode . . . 8
3.1 Preparation: limit processes and scaling relations . . . 8
3.2 Unconstrained and Constrained local limit processes . . . 9
3.3 Corrections for Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] . . . 10
4 Proof sketches for Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 . . . 11
4.1 Proof sketch for Theorem 1.1 . . . 11
4.2 Proof sketch for Theorem 1.2 . . . 14
5 Simulations: some comparisons and examples . . . 15
5.1 Monte Carlo estimates of the distribution of $\mathbb{D}$ . . . 15
5.2 Comparisons via simulations . . . 16
5.3 Comparisons via examples . . . 23
5.3.1 Bright Star Catalogue . . . 23
5.3.2 S&P 500 . . . 24
6 Further Problems and potential developments: outlook . . . 25
6.1 Uniformity and rates of convergence . . . 25
6.2 Some further directions and open questions . . . 26
6.2.1 Relaxing the second derivative assumption: . . . 26
6.2.2 Beyond dimension $d = 1$: . . . 28
7 Proofs . . . 28
7.1 The local remainder terms $R_{n,j}, R^0_{n,j}$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$ . . . 28
7.2 The global remainder terms $R_{n,1}$ and $R^c_{n,1}$ . . . 29
7.2.1 Decomposition of $R^c_{n,1,t}$ . . . 30
7.2.2 Show $T^i_n = O_p(n^{-1})$, $i = 1, 2$ . . . 34
7.2.3 Local and Global $o_p(n^{-1})$ Conclusion . . . 37
7.2.4 Return to $R^c_{n,1,t}$ . . . 39
7.3 Proof completion / details: the main result . . . 44
7.4 Proof of Theorem 1.2 . . . 45
A Lemmas . . . 47
References . . . 53

1. Introduction and overview: inference for the mode

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the class of all log-concave densities f on $\mathbb{R}$. It is well-known since Ibragimov (1956) that all log-concave densities f are strongly unimodal, and conversely; see Dharmadhikari and Joag-Dev [1988] for an exposition of the basic theory. Of course, "the mode" of a log-concave density f may not be a single point. It is, in general, the modal interval $MI(f) \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}} f(y)\}$, and to describe "the mode" completely we need to choose a specific element of $MI(f)$, for example $M(f) \equiv \inf\{x \in MI(f)\}$. For a large sub-class of log-concave densities the set reduces to a single point. Our focus here is on the latter case and, indeed, on inference concerning $M(f)$ based on i.i.d. observations $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ with density $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. We have restricted to log-concave densities for several reasons:

(a) It is well known that the MLE over the class of all unimodal densities does not exist; see e.g. Birgé (1997).

(b) On the other hand, MLE's do exist for the class $\mathcal{P}$ of log-concave densities if $n \geq 2$: see, for example, Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007], Rufibach [2006], Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009].

(c) Moreover the MLE's for the class of log-concave densities have remarkable stability and continuity properties under model miss-specification: see e.g. Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011].

In terms of estimation, Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] showed that if $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0}$ where the concave function φ_0 satisfies $\varphi_0''(m_0) < 0$ at the mode $m_0 = M(f_0)$ of f_0, then the MLE $M(\widehat{f}_n)$ satisfies

$$n^{1/5}\left(M(\widehat{f}_n) - M(f_0)\right) \to_d \left(\frac{(4!)^2 f_0(m_0)}{f_0''(m_0)^2}\right)^{1/5} M(H_2^{(2)}) \tag{1.1}$$

where $M(H_2^{(2)})$ has a universal distribution (not depending on f_0) defined in terms of two-sided Brownian motion processes: briefly it is the mode (or argmax) of the estimator $H_2^{(2)}$ of the ("unknown") concave function $g_0(t) \equiv -12t^2$ in the "white noise" model where one observes

$$dX(t) = g_0(t)dt + dW(t) \tag{1.2}$$

where W is two-sided Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}$. The limit distribution (1.1) gives useful information about the behavior of $M(\widehat{f}_n)$, but it is somewhat difficult to use for inference because of the constant $((4!)^2 f_0(m_0)/f_0''(m_0)^2)^{1/5}$ which involves the unknown density through $f_0''(m_0)$. This can be estimated via smoothing methods, but because we wish to avoid the consequent problem of choosing bandwidths or other tuning parameters, we take a different approach to inference here.

Instead, we first consider the following testing problem: test

$$H: \ M(f) = m \quad \text{versus} \quad K: \ M(f) \neq m$$

where $m \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed. To construct a likelihood ratio test of H versus K we first need to construct both the unconstrained MLE's $\widehat{f}_n$ and the mode-constrained MLE's $\widehat{f}_n^0$. The unconstrained MLE's $\widehat{f}_n$ are available from the results of Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007], Rufibach [2006], and Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] cited above. Corresponding results concerning the existence and properties of the mode-constrained MLE's $\widehat{f}_n^0$ are given in the companion paper Doss and Wellner [2016b]. Global convergence rates for both estimators are given in Doss and Wellner [2016a]. Once both the unconstrained estimators $\widehat{f}_n$ and the constrained estimators $\widehat{f}_n^0$ are available, then we can consider the natural likelihood ratio test of H versus K: reject the null hypothesis H if

$$2\log\lambda_n \equiv 2\log\lambda_n(m) \equiv 2n\mathbb{P}_n(\log\widehat{f}_n - \log\widehat{f}_n^0) = 2n\mathbb{P}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$$

is "too large" where $\widehat{f}_n = \exp(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$, $\widehat{f}_n^0 = \exp(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$, $\mathbb{P}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}/n$ is the empirical measure, and $\mathbb{P}_n(g) = \int g d\mathbb{P}_n$. To carry out this test we need to know how large is "too large"; i.e. we need to know the (asymptotic) distribution of $2\log\lambda_n$ when H is true. Thus the primary goal of this paper is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *If $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are i.i.d. $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0}$ with mode m where φ_0 is concave and $\varphi_0''(m) < 0$, then*

$$2\log\lambda_n \to_d \mathbb{D}$$

where $\mathbb{D}$ is a universal limiting distribution (not depending on f_0); thus $2\log\lambda_n$ is asymptotically pivotal.

With Theorem 1.1 in hand, our likelihood ratio test with (asymptotic) size $\alpha \in (0,1)$ becomes: "reject H if $2\log\lambda_n > d_\alpha$" where d_α is chosen so that $P(\mathbb{D} > d_\alpha) = \alpha$. Furthermore, we can then form confidence intervals for m by inverting the family of likelihood ratio tests: let

$$J_{n,\alpha} \equiv \{m \in \mathbb{R} : \ 2\log\lambda_n(m) \le d_\alpha\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then it follows that for $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m = \{f \in \mathcal{P} : \ M(f) = m\}$ with $(\log f_0)'' < 0$, we have

$$P_{f_0}(m \in J_{n,\alpha}) \to P(\mathbb{D} \le d_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha.$$

This program is very much analogous to the methods for pointwise inference for nonparametric estimation of monotone increasing or decreasing functions developed by Banerjee and Wellner [2001] and Banerjee [2007]. Those methods have recently been extended to include pointwise inference for nonparametric estimation of a monotone density by Groeneboom and Jongbloed [2015].

Remark 1.1. Theorem 1.1 says that $\mathbb{D}$ is pivotal (this is sometimes known as the Wilks phenomenon) over the class of all log-densities φ_0 satisfying $\varphi_0^{(2)}(m) < 0$. We can specify more about the limit random variable $\mathbb{D}$. Let $\widehat{\varphi}$ and $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ denote the least squares (and hence also maximum likelihood) unconstrained estimator and mode-constrained estimator of the canonical concave function in the Gaussian

white noise problems described in Subsections 2.1 and 2.2 below. Then under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the proof of the theorem shows that

$$\mathbb{D} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\widehat{\varphi}^2(u) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)^2(u))du.$$

The form of this random variable is the same as that found in Banerjee and Wellner [2001] and Banerjee [2007], if we replace our $\widehat{\varphi}$ and $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ with the corresponding random functions studied in the monotone case.

A secondary goal of this paper is to begin a study of the likelihood ratio statistics $2\log\lambda_n$ under fixed alternatives. Our second theorem concerns the situation when $f \in \mathcal{P}$ has mode $M(f) \neq m$.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ with $m \notin MI(f_0)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n}\log\lambda_n(m) &\to_p 2K(f_0, f_m^0) \\ &= 2\inf\{K(f_0, g) : \ g \in \mathcal{P}_m\} > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $f_m^0 \in \mathcal{P}_m$ achieves the infimum in (1.4) and

$$K(f,g) \equiv \begin{cases} \int f(x)\log\frac{f(x)}{g(x)}dx, & \text{if } f \prec\prec g \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here $f \prec\prec g$ means $f = 0$ whenever $g = 0$ except perhaps on a set of Lebesgue measure 0. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is sketched in Subsection 4.2 with all the details given in Subsection 7.4, and relies on the methods used by Cule and Samworth [2010] and Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011], in combination with the results of Doss and Wellner [2016a]. Theorem 1.2 implies consistency of the likelihood ratio test based on the critical values from Theorem 1.1. That is: let d_α satisfy $P(\mathbb{D} > d_\alpha) = \alpha$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$, and suppose we reject $H : \ M(f) = m$ if $2\log\lambda_n(m) > d_\alpha$.

Corollary 1.3. *If the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2 hold, then the likelihood ratio test "reject H if $2\log\lambda_n(m) > d_\alpha$" is consistent: if $f \notin \mathcal{P}_m$, then*

$$P_f(2\log\lambda_n(m) > d_\alpha) \to 1.$$

Here is an explicit example:

Example 1.4. Suppose that f is the Laplace density given by

$$f(x) = (1/2)\exp(-|x|).$$

First we note that $M(f) = 0$ so that $f \notin \mathcal{P}_1$. Thus for testing $H : \ M(f) = 1$ versus $K : M(f) \neq 1$, the Laplace density f satisfies $f \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_1$. So we have (incorrectly) hypothesized that $M(f) = 1 \equiv m$. In this case the constrained MLE $\widehat{f}_n^0$ satisfies $\int |\widehat{f}_n^0 - f^0|dx \to_{a.s.} 0$ where $f^0 \equiv g^* \in \mathcal{P}_1$ is determined by

Theorem 7.9 below, which is the population analogue of Theorem 2.10 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]. It also satisfies (1.4) in Theorem 1.2. In the present case, $g^* = g_{a^*}$ where $\{g_a : a \in (0,1]\}$ is the family of densities given by

$$g_a(x) = \begin{cases} (1/2)e^x, & -\infty < x \le -a \\ (1/2)e^{-a}, & -a \le x \le 1, \\ (1/2)e^{-a}e^{-c(x-1)}, & 1 \le x < \infty, \end{cases}$$

where $c \equiv c(a) = 1/(2e^a - (2+a))$ is chosen so that $\int g_a(x)dx = 1$. Here it is not hard to show that $a^* \approx .490151\ldots$ satisfies $c(a^*)^2 = \exp(-(a^*-1))$, while $K(f, f^0) = K(f, g_{a^*}) \approx 0.03377\ldots$.

Although the basic approach here has points in common with the developments in Banerjee and Wellner [2001] and Banerjee [2007], the details of the proofs require several new tools and techniques due to the relative lack of development of theory for the mode-constrained log-concave MLEs. To prove Theorem 1.1 we first prepare the way by reviewing the local asymptotic distribution theory for the unconstrained estimators $\widehat{f}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ developed by Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] and some of the relevant background from Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001]. We then develop corresponding local asymptotic distribution theory for the mode-constrained estimators $\widehat{f}_n^0$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$. These results are stated in Subsections 3.1 and 3.2.

Our proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are each outlined in Section 4. The complete details of the proof of Theorem 1.1 are deferred to Subsections 7.1 and 7.2. In Subsection 7.1 we treat remainder terms in a local neighborhood of the mode m, while remainder terms away from the mode are treated in Subsection 7.2. Our proofs in Subsections 7.1 and 7.2 rely heavily on the theory developed for the constrained estimators in Doss and Wellner [2016b]. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is outlined in Subsection 4.2 with further details given in Subsection 7.4.

In Section 5 we present Monte-Carlo estimates of quantiles of the distribution of $\mathbb{D}$ and provide empirical evidence supporting the universality of the limit distribution (under the assumption that $\varphi_0''(m) < 0$). We illustrate the likelihood ratio confidence sets with two data sets and also present some Monte-Carlo evidence concerning the length and coverage probabilities of our proposed intervals. Section 6 gives a brief description of further problems and potential developments. We also discuss connections with the results of Romano [1988b], Romano [1988a], Donoho and Liu [1991], and Pfanzagl [1998, 2000].

2. The white noise problem and limit processes

2.1. Unconstrained white noise problem

Our goal here is to introduce the limit processes that arise in the asymptotic (or white noise) version of the unconstrained estimation problem. First, let W denote two-sided Brownian motion, starting at 0. We then define

$$Y(t) \equiv \int_0^t W(s)ds - t^4, \qquad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}; \tag{2.1}$$

here, for $t < 0$, $\int_0^t W(s)ds = -\int_t^0 W(s)ds = -\int_0^{-t} W(-r)dr$. This is just the white noise relation (1.2) integrated twice. The *lower invelope* H of the process Y is the unique process satisfying:
(i) $H(t) \le Y(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$;
(ii) $H^{(2)}$ is concave;
(iii) $H(t) = Y(t)$ if the slope of $H^{(2)}$ decreases strictly at t; equivalently

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (Y(t) - H(t))dH^{(3)}(t) = 0.$$

We think of $H^{(2)} \equiv \widehat{\varphi}$ as the estimator of the (canonical) concave function $-12t^2$. $\widehat{\varphi}$ is piecewise linear, although it is not known if its knots are separated; they do collectively have Lebesgue measure 0. This will not affect our proofs. For the proof of the existence and uniqueness of H see Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001].

2.2. Constrained white noise problem

Now we introduce the limit processes that arise in the asymptotic (or white noise) version of the mode constrained estimation problem. As before W denotes a two-sided Brownian motion starting at 0. Let $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ be a concave function with argmax at 0. Define its knot points $\widehat{S}^0$ by $(\widehat{S}^0)^c := \left\{t \in \mathbb{R} : (\widehat{\varphi}^0)^{(2)}(t\pm) = 0\right\}$. Next, define $\tau_L = \sup \widehat{S}^0 \cap (-\infty, 0)$ and $\tau_R = \inf \widehat{S}^0 \cap (0, \infty)$. We then set

$$\begin{aligned} F_L(t) &= \textstyle\int_t^{\tau_L} \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dv, \quad H_L(t) = \int_t^{\tau_L} F_L(v)dv, \\ F_R(t) &= \textstyle\int_{\tau_R}^t \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dv, \quad H_R(t) = \int_{\tau_R}^t F_R(v)dv, \end{aligned}$$

and, with $X(t) \equiv Y^{(1)}(t) = W(t) - 4t^3$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} X_L(t) &\equiv \textstyle\int_t^{\tau_L} dX(v), \quad Y_L(t) \equiv \int_t^{\tau_L} X_L(v)dv, \\ X_R(t) &\equiv \textstyle\int_{\tau_R}^t dX(v), \quad Y_R(t) \equiv \int_{\tau_R}^t X_R(v)dv, \end{aligned}$$

with all definitions holding for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Finally let

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_-^0 &= \sup\left\{t \in \widehat{S}^0 : (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t-\varepsilon-) > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0\right\} \le 0, \\ \tau_+^0 &= \inf\left\{t \in \widehat{S}^0 : (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t+\varepsilon+) < 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0\right\} \ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

These variables satisfy $\tau_+^0 \le \tau_R$ and $\tau_L \le \tau_-^0$, but the inequalities will be strict in some cases where τ_-^0 or τ_+^0 equals 0. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *(Doss [2013b]; Doss and Wellner [2016b] Theorem 5.6). There exists a unique pair of processes H_L and H_R such that $H_L^{(2)}(t) = H_R^{(2)}(t) \equiv \widehat{\varphi}^0(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is concave with mode at 0, and such that:*
(i) $H_L(t) - Y_L(t) \le 0$ *for all* $t \le 0$, *and* $H_R(t) - Y_R(t) \le 0$ *for all* $t \ge 0$.
(ii) $\int_{(-\infty,\tau_-^0]}(H_L(v) - Y_L(v))d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(v) = 0$
and $\int_{[\tau_+^0,\infty)}(H_R(v) - Y_R(v))d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(v) = 0$.
(iii) $\int_{\tau_L}^{\tau_R}(\widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dv - dX(v)) = 0$.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 can be found in Doss and Wellner [2016b].

Remark 2.1. We note that condition (iii) in Theorem 2.1 is an analogue in the white noise problem of the condition $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\mathbb{F}_n(v) - \widehat{F}_n^0(v)) = 0$ in the finite-sample case. See Doss [2013b], Remark 5.1.11, pages 126 - 127 for a discussion.

3. Local asymptotic distribution theory near the mode

3.1. Preparation: limit processes and scaling relations

From Sections 2.1 and 2.2 we know that the processes H and $H^{(2)} = \widehat{\varphi}$ and H^0 and $(H^0)^{(2)} = \widehat{\varphi}^0$ exist and are unique in the limiting Gaussian white noise problem described by (1.2). Before proceeding to statements concerning convergence of the local processes we introduce further notation and basic scaling results. As in Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001] Appendix A, Proposition A.1, and Theorem 4.6 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] (noting the corrections indicated at the end of this section), let $\sigma \equiv 1/\sqrt{f_0(m)}$, $a = |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)/4!$, and let

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_{a,\sigma}(t) &\equiv \sigma \int_0^t W(s)ds - at^4 \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{3/5} Y((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),\\
Y_{a,\sigma}^{(1)}(t) &= \sigma W(t) - 4at^3 \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{1/5} Y^{(1)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $Y \equiv Y_{1,1}$. These processes arise as the limits of appropriate (integrated) localized empirical processes. Similar relations are satisfied by the unconstrained and constrained invelope processes $H_{a,\sigma}$, $H_{a,\sigma}^0$, and their derivatives: with $H \equiv H_{1,1}$ and $H^0 \equiv H_{1,1}^0$, where H^0 can be either H_L or H_R,

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{a,\sigma}(t) &\stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{3/5} H((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),\\
H_{a,\sigma}^0(t) &\stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{3/5} H^0((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),\\
H_{a,\sigma}^{(1)}(t) &\stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{1/5} H^{(1)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),\\
(H_{a,\sigma}^0)^{(1)}(t) &\stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{1/5} (H^0)^{(1)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma} &= H_{a,\sigma}^{(2)} \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma^{4/5} a^{1/5} H^{(2)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}\cdot)\\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2} H^{(2)}(\cdot/\gamma_2) \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}\widehat{\varphi}(\cdot/\gamma_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}
$$

and, similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}^0 &= (H_{a,\sigma}^0)^{(2)} \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma^{4/5} a^{1/5} (H^0)^{(2)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}\cdot)\\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}(H^0)^{(2)}(\cdot/\gamma_2) \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}\widehat{\varphi}^0(\cdot/\gamma_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}
$$

Here

$$\gamma_1 = \left(\frac{f_0(m)^4 |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|^3}{(4!)^3} \right)^{1/5} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left(\frac{a}{\sigma} \right)^{3/5}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\gamma_2 = \left(\frac{(4!)^2}{f_0(m) |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|^2} \right)^{1/5} = \left(\frac{\sigma}{a} \right)^{2/5}, \tag{3.4}$$

and we note that

$$\gamma_1 \gamma_2^{3/2} = \sigma^{-1} = \sqrt{f_0(m)}, \quad \gamma_1 \gamma_2^4 = a^{-1} = \frac{4!}{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\gamma_1 \gamma_2^2 = \frac{1}{C(m, \varphi_0)} \equiv \left(\frac{4! f_0(m)^2}{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|} \right)^{1/5}. \tag{3.6}$$

3.2. Unconstrained and Constrained local limit processes

Now we are ready for the statement of the convergence theorem for the local unconstrained and constrained estimator processes. As an extension of Theorem 2.1 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] we have the following theorem describing the joint limiting behavior of the estimators $(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x_0), \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x_0))$ at a fixed point $x_0 \neq m$ with $\varphi_0''(x_0) < 0$, and the joint limiting behavior of the local processes defined in neighborhoods of m under the assumption of curvature at m. Here are the assumptions we will make for this theorem.

Assumption 1. (Curvature at m) Suppose that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are i.i.d. $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ and that f_0 and φ_0 are twice continuously differentiable at m with $\varphi_0''(m) < 0$.

Assumption 2. (Curvature at $x_0 \neq m$) Suppose that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are i.i.d. $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ and that f_0 and φ_0 are twice continuously differentiable at $x_0 \neq m$ with $\varphi_0''(x_0) < 0$ and $f_0(x_0) > 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *A. (At a point $x_0 \neq m$). Suppose that φ_0 and f_0 satisfy Assumption 2. Then*

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x_0) - \varphi_0(x_0)) \\ n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x_0) - \varphi_0(x_0)) \end{pmatrix} \to_d \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{V} \\ \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbb{V} \equiv C(x_0, \varphi_0) H^{(2)}(0)$ and where $C(x_0, \varphi_0)$ is as given in (3.6) (but with m replaced by x_0):

$$C(x_0, \varphi_0) = \left(\frac{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(x_0)|}{4! f_0(x_0)^2} \right)^{1/5}.$$

Consequently

$$n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x_0) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x_0)) \to_p 0.$$

B. (In $n^{-1/5}-$neighborhoods of m) Suppose φ_0 and f_0 satisfy Assumption 1. Define processes X_n and X_n^0 by

$$X_n(t) \equiv n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(m + n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m))$$
$$X_n^0(t) \equiv n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(m + n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m)).$$

Then the finite-dimensional distributions of $(X_n(t), X_n^0(t))$ converge in distribution to the finite-dimensional distributions of the processes

$$(\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}(t), \widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}^0(t)) \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}(\widehat{\varphi}(t/\gamma_2), \widehat{\varphi}^0(t/\gamma_2)) \equiv (\mathbb{X}(t), \mathbb{X}^0(t))$$

where $H, H^0, H^{(2)} = \widehat{\varphi}$, and $(H^0)^{(2)} = \widehat{\varphi}^0$ are as described in Subsections 2.1 2.2, and 3.1. Furthermore, for $p \geq 1$

$$(X_n(t), X_n^0(t)(\rightarrow_d (\mathbb{X}(t), \mathbb{X}^0(t))$$

in $\mathcal{L}^p[-K, K] \times \mathcal{L}^p[-K, K]$ for each $K > 0$.

Remark 3.1. Theorem 3.1 is a consequence of a general theorem describing a vector of local processes in $(\mathcal{D}_K \times \mathcal{C}_K^3)^3 \times (\mathcal{D}_K \times \mathcal{C}_K)^3$ where the various coordinates describe:
(a) The localized processes $\tilde{H}_n^{(3)}, \tilde{H}_n^{(2)}, \tilde{H}_n^{(1)}, \tilde{H}_n$ in the unconstrained problem; here $\tilde{H}_n^{(2)}$ corresponds to $X_n(t)$, and the other three processes are the derivative, the integral and the double integral of $\tilde{H}_n^{(2)}$, respectively.
(b) The localized L processes $\tilde{H}_{n,L}^{(3)}, \tilde{H}_{n,L}^{(2)}, \tilde{H}_{n,L}^{(1)}, \tilde{H}_{n,L}$ and R processes $\tilde{H}_{n,R}^{(3)}$, $\tilde{H}_{n,R}^{(2)}$, $\tilde{H}_{n,R}^{(1)}$, $\tilde{H}_{n,R}$ in the constrained problem. Here, it turns out we need different processes for $t \leq 0$ and $t \geq 0$, so the L processes correspond to $t \leq 0$ and the R processes to $t \geq 0$. $\tilde{H}_{n,L}^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{H}_{n,R}^{(2)}$ correspond to $X_n^0(t)$.
(c) And then the corresponding "driving" empirical processes

$$(\tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{n,L}^{(1)}, \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{n,L}, \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{n,R}^{(1)}, \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{n,R}, \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_n^{(1)}, \tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_n),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{n,L}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_{n,R}$, and $\tilde{\mathbb{Y}}_n$ are localized integrated empirical processes, and again the L and R processes for the constrained problem correspond to $t \geq 0$ and $t \leq 0$. This theorem is given in Doss and Wellner [2016b]. The most important coordinates for the proof of Theorem 1.1 are $\tilde{H}_{n,L}^{(2)}$, $\tilde{H}_{n,R}^{(2)}$ (which together give $(\tilde{H}_n^0)^{(2)}$), and $\tilde{H}_n^{(2)}$.

3.3. Corrections for Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009]

In (4.25) of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], replace

$$Y_{k,a,\sigma}(t) := a\int_0^t W(s)ds - \sigma t^{k+2}$$

by

$$Y_{k,a,\sigma}(t) := \sigma \int_0^t W(s)ds - at^{k+2}$$

to accord with Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001], page 1649, line -4, when $k = 2$. In (4.22) of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], page 1231, replace the definition of γ_1 by

$$\gamma_1 = \left(\frac{f_0(x_0)^{k+2} |\varphi_0(x_0)|^3}{(4!)^3} \right)^{1/(2k+1)}.$$

In (4.23) of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], page 1321, replace the definition of γ_2 by

$$\gamma_2 = \left(\frac{((k+2)!)^2}{f_0(x_0)|\varphi_0^{(k)}(x_0)|^2} \right)^{1/(2k+1)}.$$

When $k = 2$ and $x_0 = m$, these definitions of γ_1, γ_2 reduce to γ_1 and γ_2 as given in (3.4). One line above (4.25) of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], page 1321, change $Y_{a,k,\sigma}$ to $Y_{k,a,\sigma}$.

4. Proof sketches for Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

4.1. Proof sketch for Theorem 1.1

To begin our sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.1 we first give the basic decomposition we will use. We begin by using $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{f}_n(u)du = 1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{f}_n^0(u)du$ to write

$$\begin{aligned} 2\log\lambda_n &= 2n\mathbb{P}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \\ &= 2n\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0) d\mathbb{F}_n - \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{f}_n(u) - \widehat{f}_n^0(u))du \\ &= 2n\int_{[X_{(1)},X_{(n)}]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n d\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 d\widehat{F}_n^0 \right) \\ &\qquad - 2n\int_{[X_{(1)},X_{(n)}]} \left(e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)} - e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u)} \right) du \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where we have used the characterization Theorems 2.2 and 2.8 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] with $\Delta = \pm\, \widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\Delta = \pm\, \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ respectively. As we will see, inclusion of the second term in (4.1) will be of considerable help in the analysis.

Now we split the integrals in (4.1) into two regions: let $D_n \equiv [t_1, t_2]$ for some $t_1 < m < t_2$ and then let $D_n^c \equiv [X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}] \setminus D_n$. The set D_n is the region containing the mode m; here the unconstrained estimator $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and the constrained estimator $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ tend to differ. On the other hand, D_n^c is the union of two sets away from the mode, and on both of these sets the unconstrained

estimator $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and the constrained estimator $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ are asymptotically equivalent (or at least nearly so). Sometimes we will take the t_i, $i = 1, 2$, to be constant in n, sometimes to be fixed or random sequences approaching m as $n \to \infty$. We will sometimes suppress the dependence of $D_n \equiv D_{n,t_1,t_2}$ on t_i, and will emphasize it when it is important. Now, from (4.1), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
2\log\lambda_n &= 2n\left\{\int_{D_n}\left(\widehat{\varphi}_n d\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 d\widehat{F}_n^0\right) - \int_{D_n}\left(e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)} - e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u)}\right)du\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{D_n^c}\left(\widehat{\varphi}_n d\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 d\widehat{F}_n^0\right) - \int_{D_n^c}\left(e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)} - e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u)}\right)du\right\} \\
&= 2n\left\{\int_{D_n}\left((\widehat{\varphi}_n - \varphi_0(m))d\widehat{F}_n - (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0(m))d\widehat{F}_n^0\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{D_n}\left((e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)} - e^{\varphi_0(m)}) - (e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u)} - e^{\varphi_0(m)})\right)du\right\} \\
&\quad + 2n(R_{n,1} + R_{n,1}^c)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_{n,t_1,t_2} \equiv R_{n,1} \equiv \int_{D_n}\varphi_0(m)(\widehat{f}_n(x) - \widehat{f}_n^0(x))dx, \tag{4.2}$$

$$R_{n,t_1,t_2}^c \equiv R_{n,1}^c \equiv \int_{D_n^c}\left(\widehat{\varphi}_n d\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 d\widehat{F}_n^0\right) - \int_{D_n^c}\left(e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)} - e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u)}\right)du. \tag{4.3}$$

Now we use an expansion of the exponential function to rewrite the second part of the main term: since

$$e^b - e^a = e^a\{e^{b-a} - 1\} = e^a\{(b-a) + \frac{1}{2}(b-a)^2 + \frac{1}{6}e^{a^*}(b-a)^3\}$$

where $|a^* - a| \le |b - a|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{D_n}\left((e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)} - e^{\varphi_0(m)}) - (e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u)} - e^{\varphi_0(m)})\right)du \\
&= \int_{D_n} e^{\varphi_0(m)}\left((\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m)) + \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m))^2)\right)du + R_{n,2} \\
&\quad - \int_{D_n} e^{\varphi_0(m)}\left((\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m)) + \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m))^2)\right)du - R_{n,2}^0
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_{n,2} \equiv \int_{D_n}\frac{1}{6}f_0(m)e^{\tilde{x}_{n,2}(u)}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m))^3 du, \tag{4.4}$$

$$R_{n,2}^0 \equiv \int_{D_n}\frac{1}{6}f_0(m)e^{\tilde{x}_{n,2}^0(u)}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m))^3 du. \tag{4.5}$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\log\lambda_n \qquad (4.6)\\
&= n\Big\{2\int_{D_n}\Big((\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))(d\widehat{F}_n(u)-f_0(m)du)\\
&\qquad -2\int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))(d\widehat{F}^0_n(u)-f_0(m)du)\Big)\\
&\qquad -\int_{D_n}\left((\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2-(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2\right)f_0(m)du\Big\}\\
&\quad +2n(R_{n,1}+R^c_{n,1}+R_{n,2}-R^0_{n,2}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we expand the first two terms in the last display, again using a two term expansion, $e^b-e^a=(e^{b-a}-1)e^a=e^a\{(b-a)+\frac{1}{2}(b-a)^2e^{a^*}\}$, to find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))(d\widehat{F}_n(u)-f_0(m)du)\\
&= \int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))(e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(u)}-1)f_0(m)du\\
&= \int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))\left((\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))+e^{\tilde{x}_{n,3}(u)}\frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2\right)du\\
&= \int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2f_0(m)du+R_{n,3}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
R_{n,3,t_1,t_2}\equiv R_{n,3}=\int_{D_n}\frac{1}{2}f_0(m)e^{\tilde{x}_{n,3}(u)}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^3du. \qquad (4.7)
$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))(d\widehat{F}^0_n(u)-f_0(m)du)\\
&\quad = \int_{D_n}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2f_0(m)du+R^0_{n,3}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
R^0_{n,3,t_1,t_2}\equiv R^0_{n,3}=\int_{D_n}\frac{1}{2}f_0(m)e^{\tilde{x}^0_{n,3}(u)}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^3du. \qquad (4.8)
$$

If we let $t_1=t_{n,1}=m-bn^{-1/5}$ and $t_2=t_{n,2}=m+bn^{-1/5}$ for $b>0$, then from (4.6) we now have

$$
\begin{aligned}
2\log\lambda_n &= n\int_{D_n}f_0(m)\left\{(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2-(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u)-\varphi_0(m))^2\right\}du\\
&\qquad +2n\left(R_{n,1}+R^c_{n,1}+R_{n,2}-R^0_{n,2}+R_{n,3}-R^0_{n,3}\right)\\
&\equiv \mathbb{D}_{n,b}+R_n. \qquad (4.9)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we sketch the behavior of $\mathbb{D}_{n,b}$. Let $u = m + vn^{-1/5}$; with this change of variables and the definition of $t_{n,i}$, $i = 1, 2$, we can rewrite $\mathbb{D}_{n,b}$ as

$$\mathbb{D}_{n,b} = \frac{n^{4/5}}{a^2} \int_{-b}^{b} \Big\{ \Big(\widehat{\varphi}_n(m + n^{-1/5}v) - \varphi_0(m)\Big)^2 - \Big(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(m + n^{-1/5}v) - \varphi_0(m)\Big)^2 \Big\} dv.$$

By Theorem 3.1.B this converges in distribution to

$$f_0(m) \int_{-b}^{b} \Big\{ \big(\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}(v)\big)^2 - \big(\widehat{\varphi}^0_{a,\sigma}(v)\big)^2 \Big\} dv, \tag{4.10}$$

where the processes $(\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}, \widehat{\varphi}^0_{a,\sigma})$ are related to $(\widehat{\varphi}, \widehat{\varphi}^0)$ by the scaling relations (3.1) and (3.2). We conclude that the limiting random variable in (4.10) is equal in distribution to

$$\begin{aligned} & f_0(m) \int_{-b}^{b} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}\widehat{\varphi}(v/\gamma_2)\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}\widehat{\varphi}^0(v/\gamma_2)\right)^2 \right\} dv \\ = \; & \frac{f_0(m)}{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^3} \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \int_{-b}^{b} \big\{ \widehat{\varphi}(v/\gamma_2)^2 - \widehat{\varphi}^0(v/\gamma_2)^2 \big\} dv \\ = \; & \int_{-b/\gamma_2}^{b/\gamma_2} \big\{ \widehat{\varphi}(s)^2 - \widehat{\varphi}^0(s)^2 \big\} ds \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

in view of (3.5). This is not yet free of the parameter γ_2, but it will become so if we let $b \to \infty$. If we show that this is permissible and we show that the remainder term R_n in (4.9) is negligible, then the proof of Theorem 1.1 will be complete. For details, see sections 7.

4.2. Proof sketch for Theorem 1.2

Recall $\mathcal{P}_m = \{f \in \mathcal{P} : M(f) = m\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} f^0_m &= \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{P}_m} \left\{ -\int \log g f_0 d\lambda \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{P}_m} \int f_0 \left(\log f_0 - \log g\right) d\lambda = \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{P}_m} K(f_0, g), \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where we will make (4.12) rigorous later, in Theorem 7.8 in Subsection 7.4. Let $\mathbb{P}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}/n$ be the empirical measure and for a function g let $\mathbb{P}_n(g) = \int g d\mathbb{P}_n$. We now have

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1} \log \lambda_n(m) = \mathbb{P}_n(\log \widehat{f}_n / \widehat{f}^0_n) &= \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{\widehat{f}_n}{f_0} \cdot \frac{f_0}{f^0_m} \cdot \frac{f^0_m}{\widehat{f}^0_n} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{\widehat{f}_n}{f_0} \right\} + \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{f_0}{f^0_m} \right\} - \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{\widehat{f}^0_n}{f^0_m} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

From this we will conclude that as $n \to \infty$,

$$n^{-1} 2 \log \lambda_n(m) = O_p(n^{-4/5}) + 2\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{f_0}{f_m^0} \right\} - o_p(1) \to_p 2K(f_0, f_m^0).$$

That $\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{\widehat{f}_n}{f_0} \right\} = O_p(n^{-4/5})$ follows from Doss and Wellner [2016a], Corollary 3.2, page 962. The convergence of $2\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \log \frac{f_0}{f_m^0} \right\}$ to $K(f_0, f_m^0)$ follows from the weak law of large numbers. The indicated negligibility of the third term in (4.13) follows from Theorem 7.10 below (which is a constrained analogue of Theorem 2.15 of Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011]); we elaborate on this in Subsection 7.4.

5. Simulations: some comparisons and examples

5.1. Monte Carlo estimates of the distribution of $\mathbb{D}$

To implement our likelihood ratio test and the corresponding new confidence intervals, we first conducted a Monte-Carlo study of the limiting distribution of the limit random variable $\mathbb{D}$ (under the null hypothesis). We did this by simulating $M = 5 \times 10^3$ samples of $n = 10^4$ from the following distributions satisfying the key hypothesis ($\varphi_0''(m) < 0$) of Theorem 1.1: Gamma$(3, 1)$, Beta$(2, 3)$, Weibull$(3/2, 1)$. The results are shown in Figure 1. Figure 1 also includes: (i) a plot of the empirical distribution of $2 \log \lambda_n$ for $M = 5 \times 10^3$ samples of size $n = 10^4$ drawn from the Laplace density $2^{-1} \exp(-|x|)$ for which the assumption of Theorem 1 fails; (ii) a plot of the known d.f. of a chi-square random variable with 1 degree of freedom, (which is the limiting distribution of the likelihood ratio test statistic for testing a one-dimensional parameter in a regular parametric model). In keeping with Theorem 1.1, the empirical results for all three distributions satisfying Theorem 1.1 are tightly clustered, in spite of the fact that the various constants associated with these distributions are quite different, as shown in Table 1; in the next to last column $C(f_0) \equiv \left((4!)^2 f_0(m)/(f_0''(m))^2 \right)^{1/5}$ from (1.1), and in the last column SLC stands for "strongly log-concave" (see e.g. [Wellner, 2013]).

Now for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ let d_α satisfy $P(\mathbb{D} > d_\alpha) = \alpha$. The following table gives a few estimated values for d_α: These are based on $350,000$ Monte Carlo simulations each based on simulating 1×10^6 observations from a standard normal. These values, and the simulated critical values for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, are available in the `logcondens.mode` package [Doss, 2013a] in R [R Core Team, 2016].

Banerjee and Wellner [2001] study a likelihood ratio test in the context of constraints based on monotonicity, and find a universal limiting distribution, denote it $\mathbb{D}_{\rm mono}$, for their likelihood ratio test. Comparison of the values in Table 2 with Table 2 of Banerjee and Wellner [2001] (particularly Method 2 in column 3 of that table) suggest, perhaps surprisingly, that $P(2\mathbb{D} \le t) \approx P(\mathbb{D}_{\rm mono} \le t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It would be quite remarkable if this held exactly, and we suspect that exact equality fails.

TABLE 1
Numerical characteristics of the distributions in the null hypothesis Monte-Carlo study

distribution	m	$f_0(m)$	$f_0''(m)$	$\varphi_0''(m)$	$C(f_0)$	SLC
N(0,1)	0	$(2\pi)^{-1/2} = .3989\ldots$	$-(2\pi)^{-1/2}$	-1	4.28	Y
Gamma$(3,1)$	2	$2e^{-2}$	$-e^{-2}$	$-1/2$	6.109	Y
Weibull$(3/2,1)$	$3^{-2/3}$	$\frac{3^{2/3}}{2e^{1/3}}$	$-\frac{27}{8e^{1/3}}$	$-\frac{9\cdot 3^{1/4}}{4}$	2.36	N
Beta$(2,3)$	3^{-1}	$\frac{16}{9}$	-24	$-\frac{27}{2}$	1.12	Y
Logistic	0	$1/4$	$-1/8$	$-1/2$	6.207	N
Gumbel	0	e^{-1}	$-e^{-1}$	-1	4.3545	N
χ^2_4	2	$\frac{1}{2e}$	$-\frac{1}{8e}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	8.7091	N



FIG 1. *Empirical distributions of* $2\log\lambda_n$ *for three distributions,* $n = 10^4$, $M = 5 \times 10^3$ *replications*

5.2. Comparisons via simulations

We now test and compare our procedure via a small simulation study. Code to compute the mode-constrained log-concave MLE, implement a corresponding test, and invert the family of tests to form confidence intervals is available in the `logcondens.mode` package [Doss, 2013a].

Romano [1988a] proposed and investigated several methods of forming confidence intervals for the mode of a unimodal density. His estimators of the mode

TABLE 2
Estimated critical values d_α

α	.25	.20	.15	.10	.05	.01
d_α	.40	.49	.61	.79	1.11	1.92

TABLE 3
Estimated coverage probabilities based on normal approximation 1000 simulations: bandwidth = h· sample standard deviation, data $N(0,1)$, $n = 100$; from Table 1, Romano (1988b), page 576

bandwidth/method	Coverage Level			
	80%	90%	95%	99%
$h = 0.3$	0.695	0.795	0.849	0.933
$h = 0.4$	0.831	0.899	0.941	0.976
$h = 0.5$	0.881	0.951	0.980	0.996
$h = 0.6$	0.939	0.976	0.990	0.998
$h = 0.7$	0.956	0.989	0.997	0.999
$h = 0.8$	0.962	0.991	0.996	1.000
JR Parzen, CP $h = 0.4$	0.831	0.899	0.941	0.976
DW Parzen, CP $h = 0.4$	0.835	0.902	0.941	0.978
DW Parzen, length	0.966	1.240	1.478	1.942
DW LR, CP	0.785	0.888	0.941	0.983
DW LR, length	0.966	1.178	1.346	1.663

and confidence intervals were based on the classical kernel density estimators of the density f going back to Parzen [1962]. One method, which Romano called the "normal approximation method", was based on the limiting normality of the kernel density estimator of the mode, followed in a straightforward way by estimation of the asymptotic variance. Romano's second method involved bootstrapping the mode estimator, and involved the choice of two bandwidths, one for the initial estimator to determine the mode, and a second (larger) bandwidth for the bootstrap sampling.

To facilitate comparison of our results to those of Romano [1988a], we first briefly describe his results. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be i.i.d. with distribution function F_0 and density f_0, let $\mathbb{F}_n$ be the empirical d.f. of the X_i's. Romano (1988b) then defines

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f}_{n,h_n}(x) &\equiv \hat{f}_{n,h_n}(x; X_1, \ldots, X_n) \equiv \frac{1}{h_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} k\left(\frac{x-y}{h_n}\right) d\mathbb{F}_n(y), \\ \widetilde{f}_{n,h_n}(x) &\equiv \frac{1}{h_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} k\left(\frac{x-y}{h_n}\right) dF_0(y). \end{aligned}$$

where the bandwidth h_n may depend on $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and k is a kernel (density) function. Let $\widehat{\theta}_{n,h_n} \equiv M(\widehat{f}_{n,h_n})$ and $\widetilde{\theta}_{n,h_n} \equiv M(\widetilde{f}_{n,h_n})$.



FIG 2. *Coverage probabilities, Romano's Table 1 compared with LR coverage probabilities, Normal approximation confidence intervals, Gaussian data (blue); LR confidence intervals, Gaussian data (magenta)*

Suppose that F_0 has density f_0 satisfying:
(A) $m = M(f_0)$ is unique with $\sup_{\{t:|t-m|>\delta\}} f_0(t) < f_0(m)$ for all $\delta > 0$; $f_0^{(3)}$ is continuous in some neighborhood of m; and $f_0^{(2)}(m) < 0$.
Suppose k satisfies:
(B) k is symmetric with a continuous derivative of bounded variation and, for some $r > 0$, k^{2+r}, $|k^{(1)}|^{2+r}$, k^3, $z^2|k^{(2)}(z)|^2$ are integrable.
Then, as Romano shows in his Theorem 2.1, if $h_n \to 0$ and $nh_n^5/\log n \to \infty$,

$$(nh_n^3)^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta}_{n,h_n} - \widetilde{\theta}_{n,h_n}) \to_d N(0, V(f_0, k))$$

where, with $J(k) \equiv \int [k'(z)]^2 dz$,

$$V(f,k) = \frac{f_0(m)}{[f_0''(m)]^2} \cdot J(k).$$

Note that if $f_c(x) \equiv c^{-1} f_0(x/c)$ for $c > 0$, then $V(f_c, k) = c^5 V(f_0, k)$ while $C(f_c) = cC(f_0)$. From (1.1) we see that the variance of the limiting distribution of $\widehat{M} \equiv M(\widehat{f}_n)$ automatically scales as c^2 while the asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{nh_n^3}(\widehat{\theta}_{n,h_n} - \widetilde{\theta}_{n,h_n})$ scales as c^5. If h is chosen proportional to c then $\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\theta}_{n,h})$ will scale with c^2, and this is why Romano [1988a] chose bandwidths proportional to the sample standard deviation.

Tables 3-6 below reproduce Tables 1-4 of Romano [1988a]. The estimated coverage probabilities of Romano's "Normal approximation" based confidence intervals for the mode are given in Tables 3-4, with rows corresponding to the

choice of bandwidth h. Note that the bandwidths chosen for Table 1 (our Table 3) with a $N(0,1)$ population are different than the bandwidths chosen for Table 2 (our Table 4) for a χ^2_4 population. The estimated coverage probabilities of Romano's bootstrap confidence intervals for the mode are given in Tables 5-6, with rows corresponding to choices of the two bandwidths h and b.

In our Figures 2-3 we plot the estimated coverage probabilities of Romano's normal approximation confidence intervals (blue) together with the target (ideal) coverage probabilities (green line), and the estimated coverage probabilities of our Likelihood Ratio (LR) based confidence intervals. As can be seen the estimated coverage probabilities of our LR based procedure are reasonably close to the nominal target values in both Figures 2 and 3 without the necessity of any bandwidth choice.

In Figures 4 and 5 we plot the estimated coverage probabilities of Romano's bootstrap confidence intervals (blue) together with the target (ideal) coverage (green line) and the estimated coverage probabilities of our Likelihood Ratio based confidence intervals: these are the same as in as in Figures 2 and 3, and hence reasonably close to the nominal target values.

Methods of bandwidth selection for various problems have received considerable attention in the period since Romano [1988a]; see especially Léger and Romano [1990], Mammen and Park [1997], Härdle, Marron and Wand [1990], Hall and Johnstone [1992], Ziegler [2001], Hazelton [1996a], Hazelton [1996b], and Samworth and Wand [2010]. Although bandwidth selection in connection with mode estimation is mentioned briefly by Léger and Romano [1990] (see their last paragraph, page 734), we are not aware of any specific proposal or detailed study of bandwidth selection methods in the problem of confidence intervals for the mode of a unimodal density. For this reason, we have not undertaken a full comparative study of possible methods here.

But we have made an initial effort to compare the lengths of Romano's "normal approximation" confidence intervals with our LR confidence intervals, which we now describe. In Table 3, the first row of the second group of rows (starting with "JR Parzen") repeats the row with bandwidth $h = 0.4$ from the first group of rows (taken from Romano's Table 1). This is the "best/oracle bandwidth" (of the bandwidths in the simulation study), achieving minimal total error in coverage probabilities summed across the four different coverage levels (for this given distribution and sample size). It is an "oracle" because it is unknown in practice. The second row in this group (starting with "DW Parzen CP") give our simulated coverage probabilities for Romano's method with $h = 0.4$ across the different coverage levels. These seem to be reasonably close to Romano's estimated coverage probabilities, so it seems reasonable to compare average confidence interval lengths for the two methods. The third row ("DW Parzen, length") gives our estimated average lengths of Romano's "normal approximation" type intervals, while the last row of Table 3 ("DW, LR, length") gives our estimated lengths of the Likelihood Ratio based confidence intervals. We see that the estimated average lengths for the LR confidence intervals are shorter or equal to those of the best/oracle bandwidth confidence intervals at all nominal coverage levels.

TABLE 4
Estimated coverage probabilities based on normal approximation 1000 simulations: bandwidth = $h\cdot$ sample standard deviation, data χ^2_4, $n = 100$; from Table 2, Romano (1988b), page 577

bandwidth/method	Coverage Level			
	80%	90%	95%	99%
$h = 0.25$	0.759	0.834	0.890	0.944
$h = 0.28$	0.796	0.870	0.914	0.958
$h = 0.32$	0.817	0.899	0.940	0.975
$h = 0.35$	0.804	0.889	0.938	0.981
$h = 0.39$	0.782	0.889	0.841	0.986
$h = 0.42$	0.705	0.889	0.914	0.976
$h = 0.46$	0.634	0.826	0.918	0.983
$h = 0.50$	0.531	0.766	0.880	0.979
JR Parzen, CP $h = 0.35$	0.804	0.899	0.938	0.981
DW Parzen, CP $h = 0.35$	0.794	0.898	0.936	0.980
DW Parzen, length	1.771	2.273	2.709	3.560
DW LR, CP	0.789	0.909	0.952	0.986
DW LR, length	1.957	2.376	2.720	3.341



FIG 3. *Coverage probabilities, Romano's Table 2 compared with LR coverage probabilities, Normal approximation confidence intervals, χ^2_4 data (blue); LR confidence intervals, Gaussian data (magenta)*

TABLE 5

Estimated coverage probabilities based on bootstrap, 500 simulations, 200 bootstrap replications: bandwidth = $h\cdot$ sample standard deviation, resampling bandwidth = $b\cdot$ sample standard deviation; data $N(0,1)$, $n = 100$; from Table 3, Romano (1988b), page 577

bandwidth	Coverage Level			
	80%	90%	95%	99%
$h = 0.2$, $b = 0.0$	0.710	0.887	0.962	1.000
$h = 0.2$, $b = 0.2$	0.682	0.786	0.898	0.956
$h = 0.2$, $b = 0.3$	0.672	0.868	0.942	0.976
$h = 0.2$, $b = 0.4$	0.724	0.882	0.952	0.984
$h = 0.4$, $b = 0.0$	0.718	0.880	0.942	0.980
$h = 0.4$, $b = 0.4$	0.646	0.852	0.924	0.978
$h = 0.4$, $b = 0.6$	0.728	0.876	0.938	0.982
$h = 0.4$, $b = 0.8$	0.764	0.898	0.960	0.988
$h = 0.6$, $b = 0.9$	0.660	0.848	0.962	0.982
$h = 0.6$, $b = 0.6$	0.628	0.846	0.918	0.982
$h = 0.6$, $b = 0.9$	0.718	0.852	0.916	0.980
$h = 0.6$, $b = 1.2$	0.758	0.902	0.944	0.984
$h = 0.8$, $b = 0.0$	0.754	0.830	0.906	0.980
$h = 0.8$, $b = 0.8$	0.704	0.842	0.914	0.980
$h = 0.8$, $b = 1.2$	0.786	0.894	0.946	0.992
$h = 0.8$, $b = 1.6$	0.776	0.888	0.960	0.998



FIG 4. *Coverage probabilities, Romano's Table 3 compared with LR coverage probabilities, Bootstrap confidence intervals, $N(0,1)$ data (blue); LR confidence intervals, Gaussian data (magenta)*

TABLE 6
Estimated coverage probabilities based on bootstrap, 500 simulations, 200 bootstrap replications: bandwidth = $h\cdot$ sample standard deviation, resampling bandwidth = $b\cdot$ sample standard deviation; data χ^2_4, $n = 100$; from Table 4, Romano (1988b), page 578

bandwidth	Coverage Level			
	80%	90%	95%	99%
$h = 0.25$, $b = 0.00$	0.758	0.872	0.928	0.986
$h = 0.25$, $b = 0.25$	0.790	0.910	0.966	1.000
$h = 0.25$, $b = 0.37$	0.822	0.924	0.972	0.996
$h = 0.25$, $b = 0.50$	0.818	0.926	0.968	0.992
$h = 0.32$, $b = 0.00$	0.644	0.786	0.854	0.964
$h = 0.32$, $b = 0.32$	0.824	0.940	0.980	1.000
$h = 0.32$, $b = 0.48$	0.816	0.922	0.956	0.992
$h = 0.32$, $b = 0.64$	0.820	0.920	0.962	0.994
$h = 0.39$, $b = 0.00$	0.582	0.764	0.862	0.970
$h = 0.39$, $b = 0.39$	0.770	0.876	0.950	0.996
$h = 0.39$, $b = 0.59$	0.792	0.916	0.954	0.990
$h = 0.39$, $b = 0.78$	0.804	0.908	0.956	0.992
$h = 0.46$, $b = 0.00$	0.538	0.688	0.786	0.918
$h = 0.46$, $b = 0.46$	0.744	0.856	0.894	0.980
$h = 0.46$, $b = 0.69$	0.784	0.924	0.964	0.992
$h = 0.46$, $b = 0.92$	0.792	0.918	0.954	0.990



FIG 5. *Coverage probabilities, Romano's Table 4 compared with LR coverage probabilities, Bootstrap confidence intervals, χ^2_4 data (blue); LR confidence intervals, Gaussian data (magenta)*

Similarly, in Table 4, the first row of the second group of rows (starting with "JR Parzen") repeats the row with bandwidth $h = 0.35$ from the first group of rows (taken from Romano's Table 2). This is the "best/oracle bandwidth" for total error in coverage probabilities across the four different coverage levels. The second row in this group (starting with "DW Parzen CP") give our coverage probabilities for Romano's method with $h = 0.35$ across the different coverage levels. These again seem to be reasonably close to Romano's estimated coverage probabilities, so it might be reasonable to compare average confidence interval lengths for the two methods. The third row ("DW Parzen, length") gives our estimated average lengths of Romano's "normal approximation" type intervals, while the last row of Table 4 ("DW, LR, length") gives our estimated lengths of the Likelihood Ratio based confidence intervals. For this population (χ^2_4), the estimated average lengths for the LR confidence intervals are longer than those of the best/oracle bandwidth confidence intervals at nominal coverage levels of 80%, 90%, and 95%, but perhaps somewhat shorter at nominal coverage level 99%.

Further comparisons of our LR based confidence intervals with methods based on kernel density estimates of the type studied by Romano [1988a] but incorporating current state of the art bandwidth selection procedures will be of interest.

We close this section with two quotes from Romano [1988a]. From the abstract of Romano [1988a]:

> "In summary, the results are negative in the sense that a straightforward application of a naive bootstrap yields invalid inferences. In particular the bootstrap fails if resampling is done from the kernel density estimate."

Romano [1988a] notes in summarizing his simulation results:

> "... but the problem of constructing a confidence interval for the mode for smaller sample sizes remains a challenging one. In summary, the simulations reinforce the idea that generally automatic methods like the bootstrap need mathematical and numerical justification before their use can be recommended."

5.3. Comparisons via examples

5.3.1. Bright Star Catalogue

We will now examine a few real examples. We first consider the rotational velocities of 3933 stars from the Bright Star Catalogue which lists all stars of stellar magnitude 6.5 or brighter (which is approximately all stars visible from earth) [Hoffleit and Warren, 1991]. See Owen [2001], page 8 (also Doss [2013b] page 217) for a brief description of the data. A star's rotational velocity is affected by other physical quantities in a galaxy, and the distribution of rotational velocities can provide evidence for or against various models of galaxy behavior. In Figure 6, we present the data, as hashes along the bottom of the plot, and some density estimates. We plot a kernel density estimate, the log-concave MLE, the mode-constrained log-concave MLE with mode fixed at 16, and the confidence



FIG 6. *Rotational velocity of* 3933 *stars with stellar magnitude brighter than* 6.5.

interval for the mode given by our likelihood ratio statistic. There is an extensive literature on using boundary kernels for density estimation when support is bounded, but for simplicity we just use the bandwidth chosen by Silverman's rule-of-thumb [Silverman, 1986, page 48], which gives 14.3. Note that the log-concave estimators automatically adapt to the boundary of the support without any extra work needed by the end user. The 95% confidence interval given by our likelihood ratio test and plotted in red in Figure 6, is $(0, 19.6)$. The interval is somewhat large for a sample size this large. This is caused by the fact that the unconstrained MLE is very flat on $[0, 16]$. This relatively flat interval is the reason we also plotted the mode-constrained MLE with mode fixed at 16. The unconstrained and mode-constrained MLEs are visually quite similar, so it is plausible that the true density indeed has an approximately flat modal region.

5.3.2. S&P 500

Next, we consider the 1006 daily log returns for the S&P 500 stock market index from January 1, 2003 to December 29, 2006. In Figure 7 we plot the data, a kernel density estimate with bandwidth chosen by the method of Sheather and Jones [1991] to be .13, the log-concave MLE, and the 95% confidence interval for the mode given by our likelihood ratio statistic. The log-concave mode estimate is 0.17, and the 95% confidence interval is $(0.10, 0.21)$. We also plot the maximum likelihood Gaussian density estimate, for comparison. The mean of the data (i.e. the Gaussian density MLE for the mean, median, and mode) is 0.04 with a Wald normal-approximation confidence interval of $(-0.004, 0.09)$. This latter confidence interval is plotted as two green diamonds along the bottom of the plot. Note that our confidence interval for the mode excludes 0 and does not intersect with the confidence interval for the mean of the data. Thus, our procedure highlights some interesting features of the data and provide evidence for its non normality. We also note that despite the potentially very different



FIG 7. 1006 *S&P* 500 *daily log returns for the years* 2003–2006

theoretical rates of convergence for mode estimators and mean estimators, the two confidence intervals are similar in length.

6. Further Problems and potential developments: outlook

6.1. Uniformity and rates of convergence

There is a long line of research giving negative results concerning nonparametric estimation, starting with Bahadur and Savage [1956], Blum and Rosenblatt [1966], Singh [1963, 1968], and continuing with Donoho [1988] and Pfanzagl [1998, 2000]. In particular, Pfanzagl [2000] considers a general setting involving estimators or confidence limits with optimal convergence rate $n^{-\rho}$ with $0 < \rho < 1/2$. He shows, under weak additional conditions, that: (i) there do not exist estimators which converge locally uniformly to a limit distribution; and (ii) there are no confidence limits with locally uniform asymptotic coverage probability. As an example he considers the mode of probability distributions P on $\mathbb{R}$ with corresponding densities p having a unique mode $M(p)$ and continuous second derivative in a neighborhood of $M(p)$. Pfanzagl [2000] also reproves the result of Has'minskii [1979] to the effect that the optimal rate of convergence of a mode estimator for such a class is $n^{-1/5}$. In this respect, we note that Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] established a comparable lower bound for estimation of the mode in the class of log-concave densities with continuous second derivative at the mode; they obtained a constant which matches (up to absolute constants) the pointwise (fixed P) behavior of the plug-in log-concave MLE of the mode. Pfanzagl [2000] also notes the results of Donoho and Liu [1991], Theorem 5.5, page 653, concerning uniformity of convergence of kernel density estimates of the mode. Apparently a considerable portion of their difficult proof is given in Donoho and Liu [1987] (which we have not seen).

In spite of the negative results of Pfanzagl [2000], we have proceeded here with efforts to construct reasonable confidence intervals with pointwise (in P

or density p) correct coverage without proof of any local uniformity properties. In view of the recent uniform rate results of Kim and Samworth [2016] we suspect that our new confidence intervals *will* (eventually) be shown to have some uniformity of convergence in their coverage probabilities over appropriate subclasses of the class of log-concave densities, but we leave the uniformity issues to future work.

6.2. Some further directions and open questions

But we now turn to discussion of some difficulties and potential for further work.

6.2.1. Relaxing the second derivative assumption:

As noted in the previous subsection, most of the available research concerning inference for $M(f)$ has assumed $f \in C^2(m, \mathrm{loc})$ and $f^{(2)}(M(f)) < 0$. Second derivative type assumptions of this type are made in Parzen [1962], Has'minskii [1979], Eddy [1980], Donoho and Liu [1991], Romano [1988a,b], and Pfanzagl [2000]. Exceptions include Müller [1989], Ehm [1996], Herrmann and Ziegler [2004], Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009].

What happens if the second derivative curvature assumption does not hold, but instead is replaced by something either stronger or weaker, such as

$$f(m) - f(x) \le C|x - m|^r$$

for some C where $1 \le r < 2$ (in the "stronger" case) or $2 < r < \infty$ (in the "weaker" case)? It is natural to expect that it is easier to form confidence intervals for m when $1 \le r < 2$ holds, but that it is harder to form confidence intervals for m when $2 < r < \infty$. In fact, Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] page 1313 gives the following result: if $f = \exp(\varphi)$ with φ concave and where $\varphi^{(j)}(m) = 0$ for $j = 2, \ldots, k-1$ but $\varphi^{(k)}$ exists and is continuous in a neighborhood of m with $\varphi^{(k)}(m) \neq 0$, then

$$n^{1/(2k+1)}(\widehat{M}_n - m) \to_d C_k(f(m), \varphi^{(k)}(m))M(H_k^{(2)}).$$

Thus the convergence rate of the log-concave MLE of the mode is slower as k increases. [On the other hand, by Theorem 2.1 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], page 1305, the convergence rate of of the MLE $\widehat{f}_n$ of f at m (and in a local neighborhood of m) is *faster*:

$$n^{k/(2k+1)}(\widehat{f}_n(m) - f(m)) \to_d c_k(m, f)H_k^{(2)}(0).]$$

Furthermore the sketch of the proof of the limiting distribution of the likelihood ratio statistic in Section 4.1 (ignoring any remainder terms) together with the results of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], suggest that $2\log\lambda_n \to_d \mathbb{D}_k$ under $f \in \mathcal{P}_m \cap \mathcal{S}_k$ where

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \{f \in \mathcal{P} : \ \varphi^{(j)}(m) = 0, \ j = 2, \ldots, k-1, \ \varphi^{(k)}(m) \neq 0, \ \varphi \in C^k(m, \mathrm{loc})\}$$

and where with φ_k and φ_k^0 denoting the local limit processes in the white noise model (1.2) with drift term $g_0(t) = -12t^2$ replaced by $-(k+2)(k+1)|t|^k$ (or t^4 in 2.1 replaced by t^{k+2}),

$$\mathbb{D}_k \equiv \int \{(\widehat{\phi}_k(v))^2 - (\widehat{\phi}_k^0(v))^2\} dv.$$

Figure 8 gives some evidence in favor of this conjecture. Note that the (Monte-Carlo estimator of) the distributions of $\mathbb{D}_3$ and $\mathbb{D}_r$ seem to be stochastically larger than the (Monte-Carlo estimator) of the distribution of $\mathbb{D}_2 \equiv \mathbb{D}$, and that the distribution of $\mathbb{D}_4$ is apparently stochastically larger than that of $\mathbb{D}_3$.



FIG 8. *Empirical distributions of* $2\log\lambda_n$ *for* $f \in \mathcal{P}_m \cap \mathcal{S}_k$, $k \in \{2,3,4\}$. $n = 10^4$, $M = 5\times 10^3$ *replications*

This raises several possibilities:

Option 1: It seems likely that by choosing a critical value from the distribution of $\mathbb{D}_6$ (say), that the resulting confidence intervals will have correct coverage for $f \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{S}_6$ with conservative coverage if we happen to have $f \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{S}_2$ (in which case critical points from $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_2$ would have sufficed), and anti-conservative coverage if the true f belongs to $\mathcal{P} \cap (\mathcal{S}_k \setminus \mathcal{S}_6)$ for some $k \geq 8$.

Option 2: Try to construct an adaptive procedure which first estimates k (the degree of "flatness") of the true $f \in \mathcal{P}$ (by $\hat{k}$ say), and then choose a critical point from the distribution of $\mathbb{D}_{\hat{k}}$.

We leave the investigation of both of these possibilities to future work.

6.2.2. Beyond dimension $d = 1$:

It seems natural to consider generalizations of the present methods to the case of multivariate log-concave and $s-$concave densities. While there is a considerable amount of work on estimation of multivariate modes, mostly via kernel density estimation, much less seems to be available in terms of confidence sets or other inference tools. For some of this, see e.g. Tsybakov [1990], Abraham, Biau and Benoît [2003], Kim [1994], Klemelä [2005], Konakov [1973], Sager [1978], Samanta [1973]. On the other hand apparently very little is known about the multivariate mode estimator $M(\widehat{f}_n)$ where $\widehat{f}_n$ is the log-concave density estimator for f on $\mathbb{R}^d$ studied by Cule, Samworth and Stewart [2010] and Cule and Samworth [2010]. Further study of this estimator will very likely require considerable development of new methods for study of the pointwise and local properties of the log-concave density estimator $\widehat{f}_n$.

7. Proofs

It remains to deal with the remainder terms defined in (4.9) in the course of our "proof sketch" for Theorem 1.1 in Section 1. We first deal with the "local" remainder terms $R_{n,j}$, $R^0_{n,j}$ with $j \in \{2,3\}$ in Subsection 7.1. Subsection 7.2 is dedicated to the proofs for the "non-local" remainder terms.

7.1. The local remainder terms $R_{n,j}, R^0_{n,j}$, $j \in \{2,3\}$

We first deal with the (easy) local remainder terms.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $t_{n,1} = m - Mn^{-1/5}$ and $t_{n,2} = m + Mn^{-1/5}$ for $M > 0$. Then the remainder terms $R_{n,2}$, $R^0_{n,2}$, $R_{n,3}$, and $R^0_{n,3}$ satisfy $nR_{n,j} = o_p(1)$ and $nR^0_{n,j} = o_p(1)$ for $j \in \{2,3\}$.*

Proof. Recall that the remainder terms $R_{n,2}$, $R^0_{n,2}$, $R_{n,3}$, and $R^0_{n,3}$ given by (4.4), (4.5), (4.7), and (4.8) are all of the form a constant times

$$\tilde{R}_n \equiv \int_{D_n} e^{\tilde{x}_n(u)}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m))^3 du, \quad \text{or}$$
$$\tilde{R}^0_n \equiv \int_{D_n} e^{\tilde{x}^0_n(u)}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u) - \varphi_0(m))^3 du,$$

where D_n is a (possibly random) interval of length $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ and $\tilde{x}_{n,j}$ converges in probability, uniformly in $u \in D_n$, to zero. But by Assumption 1 and by Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] (see also Theorem 4.6.B of Doss and Wellner [2016b]), it follows that for any $M > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{|t|\le M} |\widehat{\varphi}_n(m + n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m)| \\
&\quad \le \sup_{|t|\le M} \left\{ |\widehat{\varphi}_n(m + n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m + n^{-1/5}t)| + |\varphi_0(m + n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m)| \right\} \\
&\quad = O_p((n^{-1}\log n)^{2/5}) + O(n^{-2/5}) = O_p((n^{-1}\log n)^{2/5}),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$n|\tilde{R}_n| = nO_p((n^{-1}\log n)^{6/5}\cdot n^{-1/5}) = O_p(n^{-2/5}(\log n)^{6/5}) = o_p(1).$$

by Assumption 1 and by Theorem 4.7.B of Doss and Wellner [2016b]), it follows that for any $M > 0$ we have

$$n|\tilde{R}^0_n| = nO_p((n^{-1}\log n)^{6/5}\cdot n^{-1/5}) = O_p(n^{-2/5}(\log n)^{6/5}) = o_p(1).$$

This completes the proof of negligibility of the local error terms $R_{n,j}, R^0_{n,j}$, $j \in \{2,3\}$. □

7.2. The global remainder terms $R_{n,1}$ and $R^c_{n,1}$

Recall that the remainder terms $R_{n,1}$ and $R^c_{n,1}$ are given by (4.2) and (4.3). Note that the integral in the definition of (4.3) is over $[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}] \setminus D_n$, and hence this term in particular has a global character. We will see later that $R_{n,1}$ also can be seen as having a global nature.

Outline: From now on, we will focus our analysis on the portion of $R^c_{n,1,t_1,t_2}$ given by integrating over the left side, $[X_{(1)}, t_1]$. Arguments for the integral over $[t_2, X_{(n)}]$ are analogous. Thus, by a slight abuse of notation, define the one-sided counterpart to $R^c_{n,1,t_1,t_2}$ from (4.3) for any $t < m$ by

$$R^c_{n,1,t} \equiv \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n d\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n d\widehat{F}^0_n - \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} (e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n} - e^{\widehat{\varphi}^0_n})\, d\lambda. \tag{7.1}$$

Here λ is Lebesgue measure (and is unrelated to the likelihood ratio λ_n). The analysis of $R^c_{n,1,t}$ is the greatest difficulty in understanding $2\log\lambda_n$. The proof that $R^c_{n,1,t_n}$ is $o_p(n^{-1})$ when $b \to \infty$ where $t_n = m - bn^{-1/5}$ is somewhat lengthy so we provide an outline here.

1. **Step 1, Decomposition of $R^c_{n,1,t}$:** Decompose $R^c_{n,1,t}$, to see that

$$R^c_{n,1,t} = A^1_{n,t} + E^1_{n,t} - T^1_{n,t} = A^2_{n,t} + E^2_{n,t} + T^2_{n,t}, \tag{7.2}$$

   where the summands $A^i_{n,t}, E^i_{n,t}, T^i_{n,t}$ are defined below (see (7.11) and the preceding text).
2. **Step 2, Global $O_p(n^{-1})$ conclusion:** In this section we use the fact that away from the mode, the characterizations of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$ are identical to study T^i_n, $i = 1, 2$, which are related to $\int_{[X_{(1)},t]}(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)^2 \widehat{f}_n d\lambda$. and $\int_{[X_{(1)},t]}(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)^2 \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda$. We will show $T^i_n = O_p(n^{-1})$, $i = 1, 2$. Note $O_p(n^{-1})$ would be the size of the integral if it were over a local interval of length $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ (under our curvature assumptions), but here the integral is over an interval of constant length or larger, so this result is global in nature.

3. **Step 3, Convert global O_p to local o_p to global o_p:** Convert the global $O_p(n^{-1})$ conclusion over T_n^i into an $o_p(n^{-1})$ conclusion over a interval of length $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ local to m. Feed this result back into the argument in Step 2, yielding $T_{n,t}^i = o_p(n^{-1})$, $i = 1, 2$. Apply Lemma A.2 to show additionally that there exist knots of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ that are $o_p(n^{-1/5})$ apart in an $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ length interval on which $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\| = o_p(n^{-2/5})$, $\|\widehat{f}_n^0 - \widehat{f}_n\| = o_p(n^{-2/5})$, and $\|\widehat{F}_n^0 - \widehat{F}_n\| = o_p(n^{-3/5})$.
4. **Step 4, Concluding arguments:** Return to the decomposition of $R_{n,1,t}^c$ given in Step 1; the terms given there depend on $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n$, $\widehat{f}_n^0 - \widehat{f}_n$, and $\widehat{F}_n^0 - \widehat{F}_n$. Thus, using the results of Step 3 we can show $nR_{n,1,t}^c = o_p(1)$ as desired.

To finalize the argument, in Section 7.3, we take $t_n = m - bn^{-1/5}$, but we also need to let $b \to \infty$. Thus, the O_p and o_p statements above need to hold uniformly in b.

7.2.1. Decomposition of $R_{n,1,t}^c$

We begin by decomposing $R_{n,1,t}^c$ for fixed $t < m$. By (A.2) with $\varphi_{1n} = \widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\varphi_{2n} = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,1,t}^c &= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \widehat{f}_n^0 - \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon_n^1} \right) \widehat{f}_n^0 \right) d\lambda \\ &= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n^0 - \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon_n^1} \widehat{f}_n^0 \right) d\lambda \\ &= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n (\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0) - \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon_n^1} \widehat{f}_n^0 \right) d\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

where λ is Lebesgue measure and $\varepsilon_n^1(x)$ lies between 0 and $\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x)$. Again applying (A.2) now with $\varphi_{1n} = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ and $\varphi_{2n} = \widehat{\varphi}_n$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,1,t}^c &= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \widehat{f}_n^0 + \left(e^{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n} - 1 \right) \widehat{f}_n \right) d\lambda \\ &= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \widehat{f}_n^0 + \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n + \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon_n^2} \right) \widehat{f}_n \right) d\lambda \\ &= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 (\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0) + \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon_n^2} \widehat{f}_n \right) d\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

where ε_n^2 lies between 0 and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x)$. For a function $f(x)$, recall the notation $f_s(x) = f(x) - f(s)$ for $x \le s$ and $f_s(x) = 0$ for $x \ge s$. Now define $A_{n,t}^i \equiv A_n^i$, $i = 1, 2$ by

$$A_n^1 \equiv \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} \, d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad A_n^2 \equiv \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}^0 d\left(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n \right) \tag{7.5}$$

and define $E^1_{n,t} \equiv E^1_n$ to be

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(\tau,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}\, d\left(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\right) + \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t)) \\ + (\widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t))(\widehat{F}_n(\tau) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau))\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

and $E^2_{n,t} \equiv E^2_n$ to be

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n\right) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t)) \\ + (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t))(\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0)),\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

where $\tau \equiv \tau_-(t) = \sup S(\widehat{\varphi}_n) \cap (-\infty, t]$ and $\tau^0 \equiv \tau^0_-(t) = \sup S(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n) \cap (-\infty, t]$. We will assume that

$$\tau \le \tau^0$$

without loss of generality, because the arguments are symmetric in $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$, since we will be arguing entirely on one side of the mode.

Our next lemma will decompose the first terms in (7.3) and (7.4), into $A^i_n + E^i_n$, $i = 1, 2$. The crucial observation is that $A^1_n \le 0$ and $A^2_n \ge 0$, by taking $\Delta = \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}$ and $\Delta = \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t}$ in the characterization theorems for the constrained and unconstrained MLEs, Theorems 2.2 and 2.8 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]. Note that since $t \le m$, $\widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}$ has modal interval containing m.

Lemma 7.2. *Let all terms be as defined above. We then have*

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n) d\lambda = A^1_{n,t} + E^1_{n,t} \tag{7.8}$$

and

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n) d\lambda = A^2_{n,t} + E^2_{n,t}. \tag{7.9}$$

Proof. We first show (7.8). We can see $\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n)$ equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-} + \widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-})\widehat{f}_n d\lambda - \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} + \widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t})\widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda,$$

and since $\int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-}\, d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right) = 0$, this equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{[X_{(1)},\tau_-]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-} d\mathbb{F}_n + \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau_-]} (\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-})\widehat{f}_n d\lambda + \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n d\lambda \\
&\quad - \left(\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda + \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)\widehat{F}_n^0(t) \right) \\
&= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d\mathbb{F}_n + \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau_-]} (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}) d\mathbb{F}_n - \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d\mathbb{F}_n \\
&\quad + \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau_-]} \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau_-)\widehat{f}_n d\lambda + \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n d\lambda - \left(\int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda + \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)\widehat{F}_n^0(t) \right) \\
&= \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}\, d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0\right) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau_-))\, \mathbb{F}_n(\tau_-) - \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n d\mathbb{F}_n \\
&\quad + \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)(\mathbb{F}_n(t) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau_-)) + \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau_-)\widehat{F}_n(\tau_-) + \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n \widehat{f}_n d\lambda - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)\widehat{F}_n^0(t),
\end{aligned}$$

which equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0\right) + \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n d\left(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\right) \\
&\qquad + \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)(\mathbb{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}_n^0(t)) + \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau_-)(\widehat{F}_n(\tau_-) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau_-))
\end{aligned}$$

which equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0\right) + \int_{(\tau_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d\left(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\right) \\
&\qquad + \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}_n^0(t)) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau_-) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t))(\widehat{F}_n(\tau_-) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau_-)),
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Now we show (7.9). We see $\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0)d\lambda$ equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}^0 + \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}\right) \widehat{f}_n d\lambda - \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-^0}^0 + \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-^0}^0\right) \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda$$

and since $\int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-^0}^0\, d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0) = 0$, this equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}^0 \widehat{f}_n d\lambda + \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t)\widehat{F}_n(t) - \Big[&\int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau_-^0}^0 d\mathbb{F}_n + \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau_-^0]} \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(\tau_-^0)\widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda \\
&+ \int_{(\tau_-^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda \Big],
\end{aligned}$$

which equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t}\widehat{f}_n d\lambda + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)\widehat{F}_n(t) - \Big[\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d\mathbb{F}_n + \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0_-} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t}) d\mathbb{F}_n + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-)\widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0_-) + \int_{(\tau^0_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda\Big]$$

which equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)\widehat{F}_n(t) - \Big[\int_{[X_{(1)},\tau^0_-]} (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-)) d\mathbb{F}_n - \int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n d\mathbb{F}_n + \int_{(\tau^0_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t) d\mathbb{F}_n + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-)\widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0_-) + \int_{(\tau^0_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda\Big]$$

which equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \int_{(\tau^0_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)\widehat{F}_n(t) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-)\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0_-) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0_-) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)(\mathbb{F}_n(t) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0_-)) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-)\widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0_-)$$

which equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \int_{(\tau^0_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_n d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \mathbb{F}_n(t)) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-)(\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0_-) - \widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0_-))$$

which equals

$$\int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d\left(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\right) + \int_{(\tau^0_-,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n\right) + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t)) + (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0_-) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t))(\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0_-) - \widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0_-)),$$

as desired. □

Define $T^i_{n,t} \equiv T^i_n$, $i = 1, 2$, by

$$T^1_n = \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon^1_n} \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad T^2_n = \int_{[X_{(1)},t]} \frac{(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon^2_n} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda, \tag{7.10}$$

so that

$$R^c_{n,1,t} = A^1_{n,t} + E^1_{n,t} - T^1_{n,t} = A^2_{n,t} + E^2_{n,t} + T^2_{n,t}. \tag{7.11}$$

by (7.3) and (7.4). Recall (from page 31) that $A^1_n \le 0 \le A^2_n$. Thus

$$E^1_n - E^2_n \ge E^1_n - E^2_n - T^2_n - T^1_n = A^2_n - A^1_n \ge \begin{cases} A^2_n \ge 0, \\ -A^1_n \ge 0. \end{cases} \tag{7.12}$$

To see that $R^c_{n,1} = O_p(n^{-1})$ we need to see that E^i_n, A^i_n, and T^i_n are each $O_p(n^{-1})$ (for, say, $i = 1$). We can see already that $E^1_n - E^2_n = O_p(n^{-1})$ (by direct analysis of the terms in $E^1_n - E^2_n$ from (7.6) and (7.7)), which yields that A^1_n and A^2_n are both $O_p(n^{-1})$. However, it is clear that we also need to analyze $T^1_n + T^2_n$ to understand $R^c_{n,1}$. We need to show that $T^1_{n,t} + T^2_{n,t}$ is $O_p(n^{-1})$ to see that $R^c_{n,1,t} = O_p(n^{-1})$; but we will also be able to use that $T^1_{n,t} + T^2_{n,t} = O_p(n^{-1})$ to then find t^* values such that $T^1_{n,t^*} + T^2_{n,t^*} = o_p(n^{-1})$, which will allow us to argue in fact that $E^1_{n,t^*} + E^2_{n,t^*} = o_p(n^{-1})$ (rather than just $O_p(n^{-1})$), and thus that $R^c_{n,1,t^*} = o_p(n^{-1})$, as is eventually needed. Thus, we will now turn our attention to studying $T^1_n + T^2_n$. Afterwards, we will study

$$R^c_{n,1,t} = (A^1_{n,t} + E^1_{n,t} - T^1_{n,t} + A^2_{n,t} + E^2_{n,t} + T^2_{n,t})/2, \tag{7.13}$$

from (7.11). From seeing $T^1_{n,t^*} + T^2_{n,t^*} = o_p(n^{-1})$, we will be able to conclude that $A^1_{n,t^*} + A^2_{n,t^*}$ and $E^1_{n,t^*} + E^2_{n,t^*}$ are also $o_p(n^{-1})$, as desired. Then we can conclude $R^c_{n,1,t^*} = o_p(n^{-1})$.

7.2.2. Show $T^i_n = O_p(n^{-1})$, $i = 1, 2$

The next lemma shows that terms that are nearly identical to T^i_n are $O_p(n^{-1})$. The difference between the integrand in the terms in the lemma and the integrand defining T^i_n is that ε^i_n is replaced by a slightly different $\tilde{\varepsilon}^i_n$. Previously, we considered t to be fixed, whereas now we will have it vary with n.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $t_n < m$ be a (potentially random) sequence such that*

$$t_n \leq \max\left(S(\widehat{\varphi}_n) \cup S(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)\right) \cap (-\infty, m). \tag{7.14}$$

For $t < m$, let

$$\tilde{T}^1_{n,t} = \int_{[X_{(1)},t_n]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}^1_n} \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{T}^2_{n,t} = \int_{[X_{(1)},t_n]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2_n} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda, \tag{7.15}$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}^1_n(x)$ lies between $\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(x)$ and 0, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2_n(x)$ lies between $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x)$ and 0, and are defined in (7.23) in the proof. Then we have

$$\tilde{T}^1_{n,t_n} = O_p(n^{-1}) = \tilde{T}^2_{n,t_n}. \tag{7.16}$$

Proof. For a function $f(x)$, recall the notation $f_s(x) = f(x) - f(s)$ for $x \leq s$ and $f_s(x) = 0$ for $x \geq s$. Let $\tau \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$ and $\tau^0 \in S(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)$, and assume that

$$\tau \leq \tau^0 < m. \tag{7.17}$$

(The argument is symmetric in $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$, so we may assume this without loss of generality.) We will show the lemma holds for the case $t_n = \tau^0$, and then the general $t_n \leq \tau^0$ case follows since the integral is increasing in t_n. Now, because

$\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau}$ is concave, for $\varepsilon \le 1$, the function $\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) + \varepsilon(\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau}(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau}(x))$ is concave. So, by Theorem 2.2, page 43, of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009], we have

$$\int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau}) d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n) \le 0. \tag{7.18}$$

Similarly, if τ^0 is a knot of $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$ and is less than the mode, then since $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(x) + \varepsilon\left(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau^0}(x) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}(x)\right)$ is concave with mode at m for ε small (since $\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau^0}(x) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}(x)$ is only nonzero on the left side of the mode), by the characterization Theorem 2.8 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], we have

$$\int (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau^0} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}) d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) \le 0.$$

Then setting $II^L_{n,\tau^0} := \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\ge \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau^0} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n\right) && (7.19)\\ &= II^L_{n,\tau^0} - \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0)\right)\left(\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0)\right). && (7.20) \end{aligned}$$

And setting $I^L_{n,\tau^0} := \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^L_{n,\tau^0} = &\int_{[X_{(1)},\tau]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(u) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau)\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)(u)\\ &- \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau)\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)(u)\\ &+ \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau)\right) \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)\\ &+ \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

and, since the first two summands together yield the left hand side of (7.18), we have

$$I^L_{n,\tau^0} \le \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau)\right) \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right) + \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right). \tag{7.22}$$

Now, we apply (A.1) of Lemma A.1 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} I^L_{n,\tau^0} + II^L_{n,\tau^0} &= \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right) d\left(\widehat{F}^0_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)\\ &= \begin{cases} \int_{X_{(1)}}^{\tau^0} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}^1_n} \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda \ge 0, \\ \int_{X_{(1)}}^{\tau^0} \left(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2_n} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda \ge 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7.23}$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2(x)$ lies between $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x)$ and 0 and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^1(x)$ lies between $\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x)$ and 0. By (7.20) and (7.22), (7.23) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(\tau) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau)\right) \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right) + \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right) d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right) \\ + \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(\tau^0)\right)\left(\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{F}_n^0(\tau^0)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{7.24}$$

By Proposition 5.2 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], $\sup_{t\in[\tau,\tau^0]} \left|\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)\right| = O_p(n^{-2/5})$. By Corollary 2.5 of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009],

$$\left| \int_{[X_{(1)},\tau]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)\right| \le 1/n,$$

so the first term in the above display is $O_p(n^{-7/5})$. Similarly, by Corollary 2.12 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], $\left|\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{F}_n^0(\tau^0)\right| \le 1/n$, so the last term in the previous display is $O_p(n^{-7/5})$. We can also see that the middle term in the previous display equals

$$\begin{aligned}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(\tau^0)(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n)(\tau^0) - (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(\tau)(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n)(\tau) \\ - \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} (\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n)(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)' d\lambda.\end{aligned} \tag{7.25}$$

Now the middle term in the previous display is $O_p(n^{-7/5})$. For the last two terms, we apply Lemma A.4 taking $I = [\tau, \tau^0]$ to see that

$$\sup_{t\in(\tau,\tau^0]} n^{3/5} \left| \int_{(\tau,t]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right)\right| = O_p(1).$$

Thus, again using Proposition 5.2 of Doss and Wellner [2016b],

$$\int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} (\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n)(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)' d\lambda = O_p(n^{-4/5}) \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} d\lambda = O_p(n^{-1}), \tag{7.26}$$

so we have now shown that (7.25) is $O_p(n^{-1})$, so the middle term in (7.24) is $O_p(n^{-1})$. Thus, (7.24) is $O_p(n^{-1})$, and since (7.24) bounds (7.23) we can conclude that

$$\int_{X_{(1)}}^{\tau^0} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^1} \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda = \int_{X_{(1)}}^{\tau^0} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda = O_p(n^{-1}), \tag{7.27}$$

and so we are done. □

Remark 7.1. Note that if we computed the integrals in (7.27) over an interval of length $O_p(n^{-1/5})$, by using that the corresponding integrand is $O_p(n^{-4/5})$ (under smoothness/curvature assumptions), the integrals would be $O_p(n^{-1})$.

However, (7.27) shows that the integrals are $O_p(n^{-1})$ over a larger interval whose length is constant or larger, with high probability. Thus we can use (7.27) to show that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n$ must be of order smaller than $O_p(n^{-2/5})$ somewhere, and this line of reasoning will in fact show that $T_{n,t}^1$ and $T_{n,t}^2$ are $o_p(n^{-1})$ for certain t values.

Remark 7.2. Having shown (7.16), it may seem that we can easily find a subinterval over which the corresponding integrals are $o_p(n^{-1})$ (or smaller), and that this should allow us to quickly finish up our proof. There is an additional difficulty, though, preventing us from naively letting $|t| \to \infty$: we need to control the corresponding integrals actually within small neighborhoods of m (of order $O_p(n^{-1/5})$), not just arbitrarily far away from m. This is because our asymptotic results for the limit distribution take place in $n^{-1/5}$ neighborhoods of m.

To connect the result about $\tilde{T}_n^i$ to the title of this section (which states $T_n^i = O_p(n^{-1})$), note that by Lemma A.5, $0 \le T_n^i \le 2\tilde{T}_n^i = O_p(n^{-1})$.

7.2.3. Local and Global $o_p(n^{-1})$ Conclusion

We will now find a subinterval I such that

$$\int_I \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

We will argue by partitioning a larger interval over which the above integral is $O_p(n^{-1})$ into smaller subintervals. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We will later identify a subinterval J^* of length $Ln^{-1/5} > 0$, which we specify to be the length such that intervlas of length $Ln^{-1/5}$ whose endpoints converge to m contain a knot from each of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. Also let $\delta > 0$ and $\zeta = \delta/L$ which we take without loss of generality to be the reciprocal of an integer. By Proposition 5.1 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], fix $M \ge L$ large enough such that with probability $1 - \varepsilon\zeta$ for any random variable $\xi_n \to m$, $[\xi_n - Mn^{-1/5}, \xi_n + Mn^{-1/5}]$ contains knots of both $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$. Now, each of the intervals

$$I_{jn} := (\tau^0 - Mjn^{-1/5}, \tau^0 - M(j-1)n^{-1/5}] \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, 1/\zeta$$

contains a knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ by taking ξ_n to be $jn^{-1/5}$. There are $1/\zeta$ such intervals so the probability that all intervals contain a knot of both $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is $1 - \varepsilon$. Now, let $K = O_p(1)$ be such that $\int_{X_{(1)}}^{\tau^0} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda \le Kn^{-1}$ for $\tau^0 < m$, by Lemma 7.3. In particular,

$$\int_{I_{j^*}} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda := \min_{j=1,\ldots,1/\zeta} \int_{I_j} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda \le \zeta K n^{-1}. \tag{7.28}$$

We next conclude by Lemma A.2, since $\zeta = \delta/L$, that there exists a subinterval $J^* \subset I_{j^*}$ containing knots $\eta \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$ and $\eta^0 \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$, such that

$$\sup_{x \in J^*} |\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x)| \le c\delta_1 n^{-2/5} \quad \text{and} \quad |\eta^0 - \eta| \le c\delta_1 n^{-1/5} \tag{7.29}$$

for a universal constant $c > 0$ and where $\delta_1 \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$.

We can now re-apply the proof of Lemma 7.3, this time taking as our knots η and η^0, and again assuming without loss of generality $\eta \le \eta^0$. We again see that (7.23) is bounded above by (7.24), and the middle term of (7.24) is bounded by (7.25). Using (7.29), we can conclude by (7.26) that (7.25) is bounded by $\delta_2 O_p(n^{-1})$, so (7.24) is also, and so (7.23) is also, where $\delta_2 \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$. We can conclude

$$\int_{X_{(1)}}^{\eta^0} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda \le \tilde{\delta} n^{-1}.$$

Now $\eta^0 \ge \tau^0 - Mn^{-1/5}/\zeta$, the endpoint of $I_{1/\zeta,n}$. Thus, take $bn^{-1/5} \ge \tau^0 - Mn^{-1/5}/\zeta$, let $t_n = m - bn^{-1/5}$ and now let $J^* = [t_n - \tilde{L}n^{-1/5}, t_n]$ where $\tilde{L} = \max(L, 8D/\varphi_0^{(2)}(m))$, chosen so that we can apply Lemma A.2. Then

$$\int_{X_{(1)}}^{t_n} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} \widehat{f}_n d\lambda \le \tilde{\delta} n^{-1} \tag{7.30}$$

with high probability. Analogously,

$$\int_{X_{(1)}}^{t_n} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^1} \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda \le \tilde{\delta} n^{-1} \tag{7.31}$$

as $n \to \infty$ with high probability. And we can apply Lemma A.2 to the interval J^* to see

$$\|\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0\|_{J^*} = \delta O_p(n^{-2/5}), \qquad \|\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0\|_{J^*} \le \delta K n^{-2/5}, \tag{7.32}$$

$$\|\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0\|_{J^*} \le \delta K n^{-3/5}, \quad \text{and} \qquad |\tau - \tau^0| \le \delta K n^{-1/5}, \tag{7.33}$$

where $\tau \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n) \cap J^*$ and $\tau^0 \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap J^*$, and

$$\|(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'\|_{[\max(\tau,\tau^0)+\delta O_p(n^{-1/5}), t_n - \delta O_p(n^{-1/5})]} = \delta K n^{-1/5}; \tag{7.34}$$

here, $K = O_p(1)$ and depends on ε and $\tilde{L} \equiv \tilde{L}_\varepsilon$, but not on δ or t_n. Thus when we eventually let $\tilde{\delta} \to 0$, so $b \equiv b_{\tilde{\delta}} \to \infty$, we can still conclude $\tilde{\delta} K \to 0$. We also continue to assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\tau \le \tau^0.$$

Thus, here is the sense in which we mean o_p, for the remainder of the proof: if we say, e.g., $E^1_{n,t_n} - E^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$ we mean for any $\tilde{\delta} > 0$, we may set $t_n = m - bn^{-1/5}$ and choose b large enough that $|E^1_{n,t_n} - E^2_{n,t_n}| \le \tilde{\delta} K n^{-1}$ where K does not depend on t_n.

We can now conclude that

$$\tilde{T}^i_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{7.35}$$

The difference in the definitions of T^i_n (defined in (7.10)) and $\tilde{T}^i_n$ (defined in (7.15)), for $i = 1, 2$, is only in the $e^{\varepsilon_n^i}$'s and $e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^i}$'s. These arise from Taylor

expansions of the exponential function. The definition of T_n^i arises from the expansions of $R^c_{n,1,t}$ (see (7.3) and (7.4)). Thus, if we let $e^x = 1+x+2^{-1}x^2e^{\varepsilon(x)}$ we can see that $\varepsilon_n^1(x) = \varepsilon(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x))$ and $\varepsilon_n^2(x) = \varepsilon(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x))$. Let $e^x = 1 + xe^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)}$. Then we can see that $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^1(x) = \tilde{\varepsilon}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x))$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2(x) = \tilde{\varepsilon}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x))$. Now, by Lemma A.5, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $e^{\varepsilon(x)} \le 2e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)}$, so that

$$0 \le T^i_{n,t_n} \le 2\tilde{T}^i_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}), \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \tag{7.36}$$

by (7.35).

7.2.4. Return to $R^c_{n,1,t}$

We take t_n and J^* as defined at the end of the previous section. Now, if we could show that $E^1_{n,t_n} - E^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$ then from (7.12) we could conclude that A^i_{n,t_n}, $i = 1, 2$, are both $o_p(n^{-1})$. If, in addition, we can show $E^1_{n,t_n}+E^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$, then since

$$R^c_{n,1,t_n} = (E^1_{n,t_n} + E^2_{n,t_n} + A^1_{n,t_n} + A^2_{n,t_n} + T^2_{n,t_n} - T^1_{n,t_n})/2 \tag{7.37}$$

by (7.11), we could conclude $R^c_{n,1,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$. Unfortunately it is difficult to get any results about $E^1_{n,t_n} - E^2_{n,t_n}$. We can analyze $E^1_{n,t_n} + E^2_{n,t_n}$, though. The next lemma shows that the difficult terms in $E^1_{n,t_n} + E^2_{n,t_n}$ are $o_p(n^{-1})$.

Lemma 7.4. *Let all terms be as defined above. For any $t < m$ let $F^1_{n,t} = \int_{(\tau,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)$ and $F^2_{n,t} = \int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n)$. Then*

$$F^1_{n,t_n} + F^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

Proof. For the proof, denote $t \equiv t_n$ and recall that we assume $\tau \le \tau^0$. We see

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(\tau,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) \\
&\quad = \int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) \\
&\qquad - \left(\int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}^0_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \int_{(\tau^0,t]} (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}) d(\widehat{F}^0_n - \mathbb{F}_n) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which equals

$$\int_{(\tau^0,t]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n) d\lambda - \int_{(\tau^0,t]} (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}) d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n) + \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]} \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n). \tag{7.38}$$

Note $\|\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t}\|_{J^*} = O_p(n^{-2/5})$. This follows because $n^{1/5}(\tau^0 - t) = O_p(1)$ by Proposition 5.1 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], and because $\|(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'\|_{J^*} = n^{-1/5}O_p(1)$ by Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], since $\varphi_0'(m) = 0$. In both cases the

$O_p(1)$ does not depend on t_n. Thus, the first term in (7.38) is $o_p(n^{-1})$, since $\|\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0\|_{J^*} = o_p(n^{-2/5})$. We will rewrite the other two terms of (7.38) with integration by parts. The negative of the middle term, $\int_{(\tau^0,t]}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t})d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)$, equals

$$((\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)(\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,t} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}))(\tau^0, t] - \int_{(\tau^0,t]}(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)((\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)' - \widehat{\varphi}'_n)d\lambda. \tag{7.39}$$

Note $\|\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\|_{J^*} = O_p(n^{-3/5})$ by Lemma A.4. Thus the first term in (7.39) is $o_p(n^{-1})$ because $\|\widehat{\varphi}^0_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{J^*} = o_p(n^{-2/5})$. The second term in (7.39) is $o_p(n^{-1})$ because (7.34) implies that $\int_{[\tau^0,t]} |(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'|d\lambda = o_p(n^{-2/5})$, and, as already noted, $\|\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\|_{J^*} = O_p(n^{-3/5})$. Thus (7.39) is $o_p(n^{-1})$.

We have left the final term of (7.38). This can be bounded by

$$\left|(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,t})(\tau, \tau^0] - \int_{(\tau,\tau^0]}(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)\widehat{\varphi}'_n d\lambda\right|, \tag{7.40}$$

and the second term above bounded by $\|\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\|_{[\tau,\tau^0]}\widehat{\varphi}'_n(\tau+)(\tau^0 - \tau) = o_p(n^{-1})$ because $\|\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\|_{J^*} = O_p(n^{-3/5})$, $\widehat{\varphi}'_n(\tau+) = O_p(n^{-1/5})$ (since $\varphi_0'(m) = 0$, and recall $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is linear on $[\tau, \tau^0]$), and $(\tau^0 - \tau) = o_p(n^{-1/5})$. The first term of (7.40) is $o_p(n^{-1})$ because in fact $\|\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n\|_{[\tau,\tau^0]} = o_p(n^{-3/5})$, by Lemma A.4 (since $|\tau - \tau^0| = o_p(n^{-1/5})$), and $\|\widehat{\varphi}_{n,t}\|_{[\tau,\tau^0]} = O_p(n^{-2/5})$. Thus (7.38) is $o_p(n^{-1})$ so we are done. □

For $t < m$, define

$$G^1_{n,t} = \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t)) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t))(\widehat{F}_n(\tau) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau))$$

and

$$G^2_{n,t} = \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)(\widehat{F}_n(t) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t)) + (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t))(\mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0)),$$

so that $G^i_{n,t_n} = E^i_{n,t_n} - F^i_{n,t_n}$ for $i = 1, 2$ (recalling the definitions of E^i_{n,t_n} in (7.6) and (7.7)). The key idea now is that the first term in $G^i_{n,t}$ matches up with $R_{n,1,t_1,t_2}$. To make this explicit, we need to define a one-sided version of $R_{n,1,t_1,t_2}$. Since both $\widehat{f}_n$ and $\widehat{f}^0_n$ integrate to 1, note for any $t_1 \le m \le t_2$, that

$$R_{n,1,t_1,t_2} = -\varphi_0(m)\int_{D^c_{n,t_1,t_2}}(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n)d\lambda;$$

thus, define

$$R_{n,1,t_1} = -\varphi_0(m)(\widehat{F}_n(t_1) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t_1)). \tag{7.41}$$

The corresponding definition for the right side is $-\varphi_0(m)\int_{t_2}^{X_{(n)}}(\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n)d\lambda$, which when summed with (7.41) yields $R_{n,1,t_1,t_2}$.

Lemma 7.5. *Let all terms be as defined above. We then have for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$G^i_{n,t_n} + R_{n,1,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

Proof. The second terms in the definitions of G^i_{n,t_n}, $i = 1, 2$, are both $O_p(n^{-7/5})$ since $\widehat{\varphi}_n(\tau) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)$ and $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)$ are both $O_p(n^{-2/5})$ by Lemma 4.5 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] and Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], and the terms $\widehat{F}_n(\tau) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau)$ and $\widehat{F}^0_n(\tau^0) - \mathbb{F}_n(\tau^0)$ are both $O_p(n^{-1})$ by Corollary 2.4 and Corollary 2.12 of Doss and Wellner [2016b].

Thus we consider the first terms of G^i_{n,t_n}, in sum with $R_{n,1,t_n}$. Consider the case $i = 1$; we see that

$$\widehat{\varphi}_n(t_n)(\widehat{F}_n(t_n) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t_n)) + R_{n,1,t_n} = (\widehat{\varphi}_n(t_n) - \varphi_0(m))(\widehat{F}_n(t_n) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t_n)), \quad (7.42)$$

and $(\widehat{\varphi}_n(t_n) - \varphi_0(m)) = O_p(n^{-2/5})$ by Lemma 4.5 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] since $\varphi_0'(m) = 0$. Crucially, we are not making a claim that $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is close to $\varphi_0(m)$ uniformly over an interval, just a claim at the point t_n satisfying $t_n \to m$, so the O_p statement does not depend on b. Since $\widehat{F}_n(t_n) - \widehat{F}^0_n(t_n) = o_p(n^{-3/5})$ by (7.33), we conclude that (7.42) is $o_p(n^{-1})$. Identical reasoning applies to the case $i = 2$, using Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]. Thus we are done. □

Thus by Lemmas 7.4 and 7.5,

$$R_{n,1,t_n} + (E^1_{n,t_n} + E^2_{n,t_n})/2 = o_p(n^{-1}). \quad (7.43)$$

Now we decompose the A^i_{n,t_n} terms. Let

$$B^1_{n,t_n} = \int \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau} d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n),$$
$$B^2_{n,t_n} = \int \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0} d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n).$$

where τ and τ^0 are as previously defined (on page 38) and

$$C^1_{n,t_n} = \int \widehat{\varphi}_n'(t_n-)(x - t_n)_- \, d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n)$$
$$C^2_{n,t_n} = \int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)(x - t_n)_- \, d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n).$$

Then, for $i = 1, 2$, by the definitions of τ and τ^0,

$$A^i_n = B^i_n + C^i_n,$$

and note that

$$B^1_{n,t_n} = \int (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}) d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) \quad \text{and} \quad B^2_{n,t_n} = \int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0} - \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau}) d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n), \quad (7.44)$$

by the characterization theorems, Theorem 2.2 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] with $\Delta = \pm\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}$ and Theorem 2.8 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] with $\Delta = \pm\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau}$. Perhaps strangely, it seems it is easier to analyze $B^1_n - B^2_n$ than $B^1_n + B^2_n$, and $C^1_n + C^2_n$ rather than $C^1_n - C^2_n$. Perhaps more strangely, this will suffice. Again by Theorem 2.2 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] with $\Delta = \widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau}$ and Theorem 2.8 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] with $\Delta = \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}$, $B^1_{n,t_n} \le 0$ and $B^2_{n,t_n} \ge 0$, so

$$B^1_{n,t_n} - B^2_{n,t_n} \le \begin{cases} -B^2_{n,t_n} \le 0 \\ B^1_{n,t_n} \le 0. \end{cases} \tag{7.45}$$

Thus, if we can show $B^1_{n,t_n} - B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$ then $B^i_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$, $i = 1, 2$, so $B^1_{n,t_n} + B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$. We do this in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.6. *With all terms as defined above,*

$$B^1_{n,t_n} - B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}),$$

and thus

$$B^1_{n,t_n} + B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

Proof. Now by (7.44)

$$B^1_{n,t_n} - B^2_{n,t_n} = \int (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau}) d(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + \int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}) d(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n)$$

which equals

$$\int (\widehat{\varphi}_{n,\tau} - \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau}) d(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau^0) - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(\tau))(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n)(\tau) + \int_\tau^{\tau^0} \widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0} d(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n). \tag{7.46}$$

The first term in (7.46) equals, applying (A.1),

$$\int_{X_{(1)}}^{\tau} (\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)^2 e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}^1_n} \widehat{f}^0_n d\lambda - ((\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n))(\tau), \tag{7.47}$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}^1_n$ is identical to $\tilde{\varepsilon}^1_n$ in Lemma 7.3, and thus by (7.30) the first term in (7.47) is $o_p(n^{-1})$. The second term is also $o_p(n^{-1})$ since $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n\|_{J^*} = o_p(n^{-2/5})$ and $\|\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n\|_{J^*} = o_p(n^{-3/5})$. This also shows that the middle terms in (7.46) is $o_p(n^{-1})$. To see the last term is $o_p(n^{-1})$, recall $\|\widehat{\varphi}^0_{n,\tau^0}\|_{J^*} = O_p(n^{-2/5})$ by Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], using that $\varphi'_0(m) = 0$. Since $|\tau^0 - \tau| = o_p(n^{-1/5})$ and $\|\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}^0_n\|_{J^*} = o_p(n^{-2/5})$ we see the last term of (7.46) is $o_p(n^{-1})$, so (7.46) is $o_p(n^{-1})$, so $B^1_{n,t_n} - B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$. By (7.45), $B^1_{n,t_n} + B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$, so we are done. □

We now turn our attention to $C^1_{n,t_n} + C^2_{n,t_n}$.

Lemma 7.7. *With all terms as defined above,*

$$C^1_{n,t_n} + C^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

Proof. Note that $C^1_{n,t_n} + C^2_{n,t_n}$ equals

$$\int (\widehat{\varphi}'_n(t_n-) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-))(x-t_n)_- \, d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + \int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)(x-t_n)_- \, d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + \int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)(x-t_n)_- \, d(\widehat{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n)$$

which equals

$$\int (\widehat{\varphi}'_n(t_n-) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-))(x-t_n)_- \, d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) + \int (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)(x-t_n)_- \, d(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n). \tag{7.48}$$

Since $(\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n)(X_{(1)}) = 0$, the second term in (7.48) equals

$$-(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-) \int_{-\infty}^{t_n} (\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) d\lambda = -(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-) \int_{\upsilon}^{t_n} (\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) d\lambda \tag{7.49}$$

for a point $\upsilon \in [\tau, \tau^0]$ which exists by the proof of Proposition 2.13 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]. By (7.33), since $t_n - \upsilon = O_p(n^{-1/5})$,

$$\int_{\upsilon}^{t_n} (\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) d\lambda = o_p(n^{-4/5}). \tag{7.50}$$

Since $t_n \to m$, by Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], $(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-) = O_p(1)n^{-1/5}$. As in previous cases, by taking $t_n = \xi_n$ and $C = 0$ in that corollary, the $O_p(1)$ does not depend on t_n. Thus we have shown (7.49) is $o_p(n^{-1})$.

Since $\mathbb{F}_n(-\infty) - \widehat{F}^0_n(-\infty) = 0$, the first term in (7.48) equals

$$-(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-) \int_{X_{(1)}}^{t_n} (\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) d\lambda,$$

which equals

$$-(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-) \int_{\tau^0}^{t_n} (\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}^0_n) d\lambda \tag{7.51}$$

because $\widehat{H}^0_{n,L}(\tau^0) = \mathbb{Y}_{n,L}(\tau^0)$ by Theorem 2.10 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]. The absolute value of (7.51) is bounded above by

$$|\widehat{\varphi}'_n(t_n-) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)|(t_n - \tau^0) \sup_{u \in [\tau^0, t_n]} |\mathbb{F}_n(u) - \widehat{F}^0_n(u)|. \tag{7.52}$$

We know $|\widehat{\varphi}'_n(t_n-) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)| = O_p(n^{-1/5})$ but unfortunately it is not necessarily $o_p(n^{-1/5})$. However,

$$|\widehat{\varphi}'_n(t_n-) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t_n-)|(t_n - \tau^0) = |(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)(t_n) - (\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}^0_n)(\tau^0)| = o_p(n^{-2/5}),$$

so (7.52) is $o_p(n^{-1})$, and thus so also is (7.48); that is, $C^1_{n,t_n} + C^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$. □

Thus we have shown that $C^1_{n,t_n} + C^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$ and $B^1_{n,t_n} + B^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1})$, so we can conclude

$$A^1_{n,t_n} + A^2_{n,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

Together with (7.43), (7.36), and (7.37), we can conclude that

$$R_{n,t_n} + R^c_{n,1,t_n} = o_p(n^{-1}). \tag{7.53}$$

7.3. Proof completion / details: the main result

The preceding one-sided arguments apply symmetrically to the error terms on the right side of m. Thus, we now return to handling simultaneously the two-sided error terms. We have thus shown for any $\delta > 0$ we can find a $b \equiv b_\delta$, such that, letting $t_{n,1} = m - bn^{-1/5}$, $t_{n,2} = m + bn^{-1/5}$, we have

$$|R_{n,1,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} + R^c_{n,1,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}| \le \delta K n^{-1} \tag{7.54}$$

where $K = O_p(1)$ does not depend on b (i.e., on δ). Now by Proposition 7.1

$$|R_{n,2,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}| + |R^0_{n,2,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}| + |R_{n,3,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}| + |R^0_{n,3,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}| = o_p(n^{-1}).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} \equiv 2n(&R_{n,1,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} + R^c_{n,1,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} + R_{n,2,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} \\ &- R^0_{n,2,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} + R_{n,3,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} - R^0_{n,3,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then by (4.9), write $2\log\lambda_n = \mathbb{D}_{n,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} + R_{n,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}}$ (slightly modifying the form of the subscripts). Now fixing any subsequence of $\{n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we can find a subsubsequence such that $R_{n,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} \to_d \delta R$ for a tight random variable R by (7.54). For $b > 0$ let $\mathbb{D}_b \equiv \int_{-b/\gamma_2}^{b/\gamma_2} (\widehat{\varphi}^2(u) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)^2(u))du$, as in (4.11), which lets us conclude that

$$2\log\lambda_n = \mathbb{D}_{n,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} + R_{n,t_{n,1},t_{n,2}} \to_d \mathbb{D}_b + \delta R \tag{7.55}$$

along the subsubsequence. Taking say $\delta = 1$ shows that there exists a (tight) limit random variable, which we denote by $\mathbb{D}$. Then, since R does not depend on δ, we can let $\delta \searrow 0$ so $b_\delta \equiv b \nearrow \infty$, and see that $\lim_{b\to\infty} \mathbb{D}_b = \mathbb{D}$, which can now be seen to be pivotal. Thus along this subsubsequence, $2\log\lambda_n \to_d \mathbb{D}$. This was true for an arbitrary subsubsequence, and so the convergence in distribution holds along the original sequence. Thus,

$$2\log\lambda_n \to_d \mathbb{D} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

7.4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this subsection we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2, which was sketched in Subsection 4.2. It remains to justify the definition given in (4.12), and to show that the third term of (4.13) is $o_p(1)$, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. We first state three theorems. These are mode-constrained analogues of Theorems 2.2, 2.7, and 2.15 of Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011], and are proved with methods similar to the methods used in Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011]. The full proofs will be given in a separate work on estimation and inference for modal regression functions.

Now, much as in Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011], we set

$$L(\varphi, Q) \equiv \int \varphi dQ - \int e^{\varphi} d\lambda + 1$$

and define

$$L_m(Q) \equiv \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_m} L(\varphi, Q)$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_m \equiv \{\varphi : \ m \in MI(\varphi), \varphi \text{ concave}\}$$

and recall $MI(\varphi) \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ \varphi(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \varphi(y)\}$. If for fixed Q there exists $\psi_m \in \mathcal{C}_m$ such that

$$L(\psi_m, Q) = L_m(Q) \in \mathbb{R},$$

then ψ_m will automatically satisfy $\int \exp(\psi_m(x))dx = 1$: note that $\phi + c \in \mathcal{C}_m$ for any fixed $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_m$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial c} L(\mathcal{C} + c, Q) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial c} \left\{ \int (\phi + c) dQ - e^c \int e^{\phi} d\lambda + 1 \right\} \\ &= 1 - e^c \int e^{\phi} d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

if $L(\phi, Q) \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus $L(\phi + c, Q)$ is maximal for $c = -\log \int e^{\phi} d\lambda$.
For the next theorem we need to define

$$\text{csupp}_m(Q) = \bigcap \left\{ C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d : C \text{ closed, convex }, Q(C) = 1, m \in C \right\}.$$

Theorem 7.8. *Let Q be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The value of $L_m(Q)$ is real if and only if $\int |x| dQ(x) < \infty$ and $int(csupp_m(Q)) \neq \emptyset$. In that case there exists a unique $\psi_m \equiv \psi_m(\cdot|Q) \in argmax_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_m} L(\varphi, Q)$. This function ψ_m satisfies $\int e^{\psi_m} d\lambda = 1$ and*

$$int(csupp_m(Q)) \subseteq dom(\psi_m) \subseteq csupp_m(Q)$$

where $dom(\psi_m) \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ \psi_m(x) > -\infty\}$.

Theorem 7.8 justifies rigorously the definition given in (4.12), since $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ has a finite mean and is non-degenerate. Now, for $\psi_m \in \mathcal{C}_m$, let

$$\mathcal{S}(\psi_m) = \{x \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi_m) : \ \psi_m(x) > 2^{-1}\left(\psi_m(x-\delta) + \psi_m(x+\delta)\right) \quad \text{for all } \delta > 0\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_L(\psi_m) = \{x \in \mathcal{S}(\psi_m) : \psi_m'(x-) > 0\} \subseteq (-\infty, m],$$
$$\mathcal{S}_R(\psi_m) = \{x \in \mathcal{S}(\psi_m) : \psi_m'(x+) < 0\} \subseteq [m, \infty).$$

It is possible for m to be an element of either of the sets $\mathcal{S}_L(\psi_m)$ and $\mathcal{S}_R(\psi_m)$ without being a member of the other. The following theorem is the population analogue of Theorem 2.10 of Doss and Wellner [2016b].

Theorem 7.9. *Let Q be a non-degenerate distribution on $\mathbb{R}$ with finite first moment and distribution function G. Let F_m be a distribution function with log-density $\varphi_m \in \mathcal{C}_m$. Then $\varphi_m = \psi(\cdot|Q)$ if and only if*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{x} F_m(y)dy \le \int_{-\infty}^{x} G(y)dy \quad \textit{for all} \ \ x \le m, \quad \textit{and} \tag{7.56}$$
$$\int_{x}^{\infty} (1 - F_m(y))dy \le \int_{x}^{\infty} (1 - G(y))dy \quad \textit{for all} \ \ x \ge m, \tag{7.57}$$

with equality in (7.56) if $x \in \mathcal{S}_L(\varphi_m)$ and equality in (7.57) if $x \in \mathcal{S}_R(\varphi_m)$.

Thus, again much as in Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011], for $x \in \mathcal{S}(\psi_m(\cdot|Q))$, $x \le m$, and (small) $\delta > 0$,

$$0 \le \frac{1}{\delta}\int_{x-\delta}^{x} (F_m(y) - G(y))dy \to F_m(x) - G(x-) \ \ \text{as } \delta \searrow 0,$$
$$0 \ge \frac{1}{\delta}\int_{x}^{x+\delta} F_m(y) - G(y))dy \to F_m(x) - G(x) \ \ \text{as} \ \ \delta \searrow 0,$$

and hence $G(x-) \le F_m(x) \le G(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now we need to understand the properties of the maps $Q \mapsto L_m(Q)$ and $Q \mapsto \psi_m(\cdot|Q)$ on $\mathcal{Q}_1 \cap \mathcal{Q}_{0,m}$, where we let $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \left\{Q : \int |x|dQ < \infty\right\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{0,m} = \{Q : \mathrm{int}(\mathrm{csupp}_m(Q)) \ne \emptyset\}$. As in Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011] we show that these are both continuous with respect to Mallows distance D_1:

$$D_1(Q, Q') \equiv \inf_{(X,X')} E|X - X'|$$

where the infimum is taken over all pairs (X, X') of random variables $X \sim Q$ and $X' \sim Q'$ on a common probability space. Convergence of Q_n to Q in Mallows distance is equivalent to having $\int |x|dQ_n \to \int |x|dQ$ and $Q_n \Rightarrow Q$ [Mallows, 1972].

Theorem 7.10. *Let $\{Q_n\}$ be a sequence of distributions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $D_1(Q_n, Q) \to 0$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_1$. Then*

$$L_m(Q_n) \to L_m(Q).$$

If $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{0,m} \cap \mathcal{Q}_1$ the probability densities $f^0 \equiv \exp(\psi_m(\cdot|Q))$ and $f_n^0 \equiv \exp(\psi_m(\cdot|Q_n))$ are well-defined for large n and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty, x\to y} f_n^0(x) &= f^0(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \partial\{f^0 > 0\}, \\ \limsup_{n\to\infty, x\to y} f_n^0(x) &\le f^0(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad y \in \partial\{f^0 > 0\}, \\ \int |f_n^0(x) - f^0(x)| dx &\to 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can now show that the third term of (4.13) is $o_p(1)$ under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. First note that $\mathbb{P}_n$ converges weakly to P, the measure corresponding to $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$, with probability 1 and $\mathbb{P}_n(|x|) = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n |X_i| \to_{a.s.} \int |x| dP(x)$ by the strong law of large numbers. Thus $D_1(\mathbb{P}_n, P) \to_{a.s.} 0$. It follows from Theorem 7.10 that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \widehat{f}_n^0 &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\varphi\in\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_n\varphi - \int e^{\varphi} d\lambda + 1 \right\} \\ &= \psi_m(\cdot|\mathbb{P}_n) = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \end{aligned}$$

where, by the last part of Theorem 7.10, $\int |\widehat{f}_n^0 - f_m^0| d\lambda \to_{a.s.} 0$ and by the continuity

$$\begin{aligned} L_m(\mathbb{P}_n) &= L(\psi_m(\cdot|\mathbb{P}_n), \mathbb{P}_n) = \mathbb{P}_n \log \widehat{f}_n^0 \\ &\to_{a.s.} L(\psi_m(\cdot|P), P) = P(\log f_m^0). \end{aligned} \tag{7.58}$$

But then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n \log \frac{\widehat{f}_n^0}{f_m^0} &= \mathbb{P}_n \log \widehat{f}_n^0 - P \log f_m^0 - (\mathbb{P}_n \log f_m^0 - P \log f_m^0) \\ &\to_{a.s.} 0 - 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (7.58) for the first term and the strong law of large numbers for the second term (using that $-\infty < L_m(P) < \infty$ by Theorem 7.8).

Appendix A: Lemmas

Below are some necessary lemmas.

Lemma A.1. *Let $f_{in} = e^{\varphi_{in}}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and let x be such that $|f_{1n}(x) - f_{2n}(x)| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Then*

$$f_{1n}(x) - f_{2n}(x) = (\varphi_{1n}(x) - \varphi_{2n}(x))\, e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n(x)} e^{\varphi_{2n}(x)} \tag{A.1}$$

$$= \left(\varphi_{1n}(x) - \varphi_{2n}(x) + \frac{(\varphi_{1n}(x) - \varphi_{2n}(x))^2}{2} e^{\varepsilon_n(x)} \right) e^{\varphi_{2n}(x)} \tag{A.2}$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n(x)$ and $\varepsilon_n(x)$ both lie between 0 and $\varphi_{1n}(x)-\varphi_{2n}(x)$, and thus converge to 0 as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. Taylor expansion shows

$$f_{1n}(x) - f_{2n}(x) = e^{\varphi_{1n}(x)} - e^{\varphi_{2n}(x)} = \left(e^{\varphi_{1n}(x)-\varphi_{2n}(x)} - 1\right) e^{\varphi_{2n}(x)}$$
$$= (\varphi_{1n}(x) - \varphi_{2n}(x))\, e^{\varepsilon_n(x)} e^{\varphi_{2n}(x)},$$

yielding (A.1). The second expression, (A.2), follows from a similar (two-term) expansion. □

Lemma A.2. *Assume φ_0 is twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of m and $\varphi_0''(m) < 0$. Let I be a random interval whose endpoints are in an $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ neighborhood of m. Let D be such that for any $\xi_n \to m$, $|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(\xi_n) - \varphi_0'(\xi_n)| \le Dn^{-1/5}$ with probability $1-\varepsilon$ for large n by Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]. for $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume $n^{1/5}\lambda(I) \ge 8D/\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)$. Let $L > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\check{\delta} > 0$. Suppose there exists $\check{K} > 0$ such that*

$$\int_I (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2 d\lambda \le \frac{\check{\delta}}{L}\check{K}n^{-1} \tag{A.3}$$

with probability $1-\varepsilon$ for n large. Then for any interval $J \subset I$ where $\lambda(J) = Ln^{-1/5}$, we have with probability $1-\varepsilon$ for n large

(A) $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0\|_J \le \delta O_p(n^{-2/5})$,
(B) $\|\widehat{f}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0\|_J \le \delta O_p(n^{-2/5})$,
(C) $\|\widehat{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0\|_J \le \delta O_p(n^{-3/5})$, and
(D) there exist knots $\eta \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n) \cap J$ and $\eta^0 \in S(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap J$ such that $|\eta - \eta^0| \le \delta O_p(n^{-1/5})$,
(E) and, letting $K = [\max(\eta, \eta^0) + \delta O_p(n^{-1/5}), \sup J - \delta O_p(n^{-1/5})]$, we have $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n' - (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'\|_K \le \delta O_p(n^{-1/5})$,

where $\delta \to 0$ as $\check{\delta} \to 0$.

Proof. First we prove the first three statements. By Taylor expansion, $\varphi_0'(x) = \varphi_0^{(2)}(\xi)(x-m)$ where ξ is between x and m. Let $J = [j_1, j_2] \subseteq I$. Then $\varphi_0'(j_2) - \varphi_0'(j_1) \ge |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|Ln^{-1/5}2$ for n large enough since $\varphi_0^{(2)}$ is continuous near m. Note with probability $1-\varepsilon$, $|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(j_1) - \varphi_0'(j_1)|$ and $|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(j_2) - \varphi_0'(j_2)|$ are less than $n^{-1/5}D$ by applying Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] twice taking $\xi_n = j_1$ and $\xi_n = j_2$, and $C = 0$ (not $C = \lambda(J)$). Here $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'$ may be the right or left derivative. Now apply Lemma A.3 (taking I in that lemma to be our J) with $\varphi_U' - \varphi_L' = n^{-1/5}\left(2D + |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|L/2\right)$ and $\varepsilon = \check{\delta}\check{K}n^{-1}/L$. Then for small enough $\check{\delta}$,

$$\left(\frac{\check{\delta}\check{K}}{L(2D + |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|L/2)^2}\right)^{1/3} n^{-1/5} \le Ln^{-1/5} = \lambda(J),$$

as needed. Thus, Lemma A.3 allows us to conclude

$$\|\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n\| \leq \left(8\frac{n^{-6/5}\check{\delta}\check{K}}{L}\left(2D + \varphi_0^{(2)}(m)L/2\right)\right)^{1/3}.$$

Thus taking $\check{\delta}$ so that $\check{\delta}\check{K}D \to 0$, we see that Lemma A.2 (A) holds. Then (B) follows by the delta method (or Taylor expansion of exp). Note that $\check{K}$ and D depend only on ε, not on I.

We show (C) and (D) next. Note that (C) follows from (D) and (B). This is because

$$\widehat{F}_n(x) - \widehat{F}_n^0(x) = \widehat{F}_n(\eta) - \widehat{F}_n^0(\eta) + \int_\eta^x (\widehat{f}_n(x) - \widehat{f}_n^0(x))dx.$$

By (B), the second term above is $\delta O_p(n^{-3/5})$ since $x \in J$ satisfies $|x - \eta| \leq Ln^{-1/5}$. We can next see that the first term in the previous display is $\delta^{1/2}O_p(n^{-3/5})$. Notice that $\sup_{t\in[\eta,\eta^0]} |\int_\eta^t d(\widehat{F}_n(u) - \mathbb{F}_n(u))| = \delta^{1/2}O_p(n^{-3/5})$ by Lemma A.4, where the random variable implicit in the O_p statement depends on J only through L. Since $|\widehat{F}_n(\eta) - \mathbb{F}_n(\eta)| \leq 1/n$ by Corollary 2.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], we see that $\sup_{t\in[\eta,\eta^0]} |\widehat{F}_n(t) - \mathbb{F}_n(t)| = \delta^{1/2}O_p(n^{-3/5})$. Similarly, since $|\widehat{F}_n^0(\eta^0) - \mathbb{F}_n(\eta^0)| \leq 1/n$ by Corollary 2.12 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], $\sup_{t\in[\eta,\eta^0]} |\widehat{F}_n^0(t) - \mathbb{F}_n(t)| = \delta^{1/2}O_p(n^{-3/5})$ by analogous computations. Together, these let us conclude that $\sup_{t\in[\eta,\eta^0]} |\widehat{F}_n^0(t) - \widehat{F}_n(t)| = \delta^{1/2}O_p(n^{-3/5})$.

Now we prove (D). Let $\delta > 0$ and define i_1 and i_2 by $I = [i_1 - \delta n^{-1/5}, i_2 + \delta n^{-1/5}]$, taking δ small enough that $i_1 < i_2$. Let $i_2 - i_1 = \tilde{M}n^{-1/5}$. Then, by the Taylor expansion of φ_0' (see the beginning of this proof), $\varphi_0'(i_2) - \varphi_0'(i_1) \geq |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|\tilde{M}n^{-1/5}/2$ for δ small and n large enough, since $\varphi_0^{(2)}$ is continuous. Additionally, by applying Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b] twice, taking $\xi_n = i_1$ and $\xi_n = i_2$ and $C = 0$ (not $C = \tilde{M}$), we find D (independent of $\lambda(I)$) such that $|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(i_1) - \varphi_0'(i_1)|$ and $|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(i_2) - \varphi_0'(i_2)|$ are, with probability $1-\varepsilon$, less than $n^{-1/5}D$. Here $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'$ may be the right or left derivative. For δ small enough, by assumption $D < |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|\tilde{M}/8$, and we then have $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(i_1+) - (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(i_2-) \geq |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|\tilde{M}n^{-1/5}/4$. We do not know a priori how much $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'$ decreases at any specific knot in $S(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$, but by partitioning $[i_1, i_2]$ into intervals of a fixed length, we can find one such interval on which $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'$ decreases by the corresponding average amount. That is, there exists a subinterval of $[i_1, i_2]$, denoted $J^* = [l^*, r^*]$, of length $2\delta n^{-1/5}$, such that

$$(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(l^*+) - (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(r^*-) \geq \frac{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|\tilde{M}n^{-1/5}/4}{(i_2 - i_1)/2\delta n^{-1/5}} = \frac{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|\delta n^{-1/5}}{2} \equiv Kn^{-1/5}$$

since $i_2 - i_1 = \tilde{M}n^{-1/5}$. Let $x_l^* = \sup\{x \in J^* : (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'(x) \geq 0\}$, and let $x_l^* = l^*$ if the set is empty, and let $x_r^* = \inf\{x \in J^* : (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'(x) \leq 0\}$, and $x_r^* = x_l^* = r^*$ if the set is empty. Now $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'$ decreases by at least $Kn^{-1/5}/2$ on either $[l^*, x_l^*]$ or on $[x_r^*, r^*]$ (since $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'$ is constant on $[x_l^*, x_r^*]$). Let

$\eta_l^0 = \inf S(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap J^*$ and $\eta_r^0 = \sup S(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap J^*$. Now by assumption $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is linear on $[\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_r^0 + \delta n^{-1/5}]$ (since $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is linear on J^* and within $\delta n^{-1/5}$ of any knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$), and so

$$(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'(u) \geq \frac{Kn^{-1/5}}{2} \qquad \text{for } u \in [\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0], \quad \text{or} \tag{A.4}$$

$$(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'(u) \leq -\frac{Kn^{-1/5}}{2} \qquad \text{for } u \in [\eta_r^0, \eta_r^0 + \delta n^{-1/5}], \tag{A.5}$$

depending on whether $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'$ decreases by $Kn^{-1/5}/2$ on $[l^*, x_l^*]$ (in which case $\eta_l^0 \leq x_l^*$) or on $[x_r^*, r^*]$ (in which case $x_r^* \leq \eta_r^0$). (In the former case, (A.4) holds because $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)'$ is nonincreasing and its decrease to 0 on $[l^*, x_l^*]$ actually happens on $[\eta_l^0, x_l^*]$ since η_l^0 is the last knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ in J^*. Similar reasoning in the latter case yields (A.5).) If (A.4) holds then

$$\sup_{u \in [\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0]} |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u)| \geq (Kn^{-1/5}/2)(\delta n^{-1/5}/2) = |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)| n^{-2/5}\delta^2/8,$$

and if (A.5) holds then $\sup_{u \in [\eta_r^0, \eta_r^0 + \delta n^{-1/5}]} |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u)| \geq |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)| n^{-2/5}\delta^2/8$. This allows us to lower bound $\int_I (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u))^2$, to attain a contradiction with (A.3).

Assume that (A.4) holds. The case where (A.5) holds is shown analogously. Let $z = \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in [i_1, i_2]} |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u)|$. Let L be the affine function such that $L(z) = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(z) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(z)$ and L has slope $Kn^{-1/5}/2$. Then for $x \in [\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0]$, $|L(x)| \leq |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x)|$. For $z \leq x \leq \eta_l^0$, this is because

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x)| = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x) &= \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(z) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(z) + \int_z^x (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)' d\lambda \\ &\geq L(z) + \int_z^x L' d\lambda = |L(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds since $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n$ is increasing on $[\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0]$ (by (A.4)), so by the definition of z, $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x) \geq 0$ for $x \geq z$, and the last is similar. For $\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5} \leq x \leq z$,

$$\begin{aligned} -|\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(x)| = (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(x) &= (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(z) - \int_x^z (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)' d\lambda \\ &\leq L(z) - \int_x^z L' d\lambda = -|L(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first and last equalities follow because for $\eta_l^0 \leq x \leq z$, since $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n$ is increasing it must be negative by the definition of z. Thus, $|L(u)| \leq |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u)|$ on $[\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0]$ so

$$\frac{\delta^3 K^2 n^{-1}}{3 \cdot 2^5} \leq \int_{[\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0]} L^2 d\lambda \leq \int_{[\eta_l^0 - \delta n^{-1/5}, \eta_l^0]} (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2 d\lambda \leq \int_I (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2 d\lambda,$$

where the quantity on the far left is $\int_0^{\delta n^{-1/5}/2}(xKn^{-1/5}/2)^2dx$. This is a contradiction if δ is fixed and we let $\check{\delta}\to 0$, since $[\eta_l^0-\delta n^{-1/5},\eta_r^0+\delta n^{-1/5}]\subset I$ by the definition of $[i_1,i_2]$, and then $\int_I(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n)^2d\lambda\le\check{\delta}\check{K}n^{-1}$. A similar inequality can be derived if (A.5) holds. Thus $\delta\to 0$ as $\check{\delta}\to 0$.

Finally, we show (E) holds with similar logic. Let $\xi_1<\xi_2$ be points such that $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is linear on $[\xi_1,\xi_2]$, and let $\delta>0$. Then if all knots ξ^0 of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ satisfy $|\xi_i-\xi^0|>\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$, $i=1,2$, then we can see that $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n'-(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'\|_{[\xi_1,\xi_2]}\le\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$. This is because at any $x\in[\xi_1+\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5},\xi_2-\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}]$, if $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n)'(x)>\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$, then $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n)'>\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$ on $[x-\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5},x]$ (since $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is linear on a $\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$ neighborhood of x), so $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n)(x-\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5},x]>\delta n^{-2/5}$, a contradiction. Here we use the notation $g(a,b]=g(b)-g(a)$. Similarly if $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n)'(x)<\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$ then $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n)(x,x+\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}]<-\delta n^{-2/5}$, a contradiction. We have thus shown that if we take η and η^0 to be the largest knot pair within $\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$ (meaning $\max(\eta,\eta^0)$ is largest among such pairs) then $\|(\widehat{\varphi}_n-\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'\|_{[\max(\eta,\eta^0),\sup J-\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}]}\le\sqrt{\delta}n^{-1/5}$, by Part (A) and by partitioning $[\max(\eta,\eta^0),\sup J]$ into intervals on which $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is linear. □

The proofs of Parts (D) and (E) in the previous lemma could also be completed with the roles of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ reversed. The next lemma provides the calculation used in Lemma A.2 to translate an upper bound on $\int_I\left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-\widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2d\lambda$ into an upper bound on $\sup_{x\in I}\left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x)-\widehat{\varphi}_n(x)\right)$ for an appropriate interval I.

Lemma A.3. *Let $\varepsilon>0$. Assume φ_i, $i=1,2$, are functions on an interval I, where*

$$\varphi_L'\le\varphi_i'(x)\le\varphi_U'\ \text{ for } x\in I, i=1,2, \tag{A.6}$$

where φ_i' refers to either the left or right derivative and φ_L',φ_U' are real numbers. Assume I is of length no smaller than $\left(\varepsilon/\left(\varphi_U'-\varphi_L'\right)^2\right)^{1/3}$. Assume that $\int_I\left(\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)\right)^2dx\le\varepsilon$. Then

$$\sup_{x\in I}|\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)|\le\left(8\varepsilon\left(\varphi_U'-\varphi_L'\right)\right)^{1/3}.$$

Proof. Assume that x is such that $\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)=\delta$, and without loss of generality, $\delta>0$. Then by (A.6), if y is such that $|x-y|\le(\delta/2)/(\varphi_U'-\varphi_L')$ then $\varphi_1(y)-\varphi_2(y)\ge\delta/2$. Thus, if I is an interval whose length is no smaller than $(\delta/2)/(\varphi_U'-\varphi_L')$ then if $\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)\ge\delta$ for any $x\in J\subseteq I$ where the length of J is equal to $(\delta/2)/(\varphi_U'-\varphi_L')$, then

$$\int_I\left(\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)\right)^2dx\ge\int_J\left(\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)\right)^2dx\ge\frac{\delta^2}{2^2}\lambda(J)=\frac{1}{8}\frac{\delta^3}{\varphi_U'-\varphi_L'}.$$

Thus, substituting $\varepsilon=\frac{1}{8}\frac{\delta^3}{\varphi_U'-\varphi_L'}$, we see that for $x\in I$, $|\varphi_1(x)-\varphi_2(x)|\le\left(8\varepsilon\left(\varphi_U'-\varphi_L'\right)\right)^{1/3}$, as desired. □

Lemma A.4. *Let either Assumption 1 hold at $x_0 = m$ or Assumption 2 hold at $x_0 \neq m$, and let $\widehat{F}_n^0$ and $\widehat{F}_n$ be the log-concave mode-constrained and unconstrained MLEs of F_0. Let $I = [v_1, v_2]$ be a random interval whose dependence on n is suppressed and such that $n^{1/5}(v_j - x_0) = O_p(1), j = 1, 2$. Then*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{[v_1,t]} d(\widehat{F}_n(u) - \mathbb{F}_n(u)) \right| \\ \\ \sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{[v_1,t]} d(\widehat{F}_n^0(u) - \mathbb{F}_n(u)) \right| \end{array} \right\} = \sqrt{\lambda(I)} O_p(n^{-2/5}). \tag{A.7}$$

The random variables implicit in the O_p statements in (A.7) depend on I through its length (in which they are increasing) and not the location of its endpoints.

Proof. We analyze $\sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{v_1}^t d(\widehat{F}_n(u) - \mathbb{F}_n(u)) \right|$ first. Note

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{[v_1,t]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n\right) \right| \\ &\quad \leq \sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{v_1}^t \left(\widehat{f}_n(u) - f_0(v_1) - (u - v_1) f_0'(v_1) \right) du \right. \\ &\qquad\qquad - \int_{v_1}^t \left(f_0(u) - f_0(v_1) - (u - v_1) f_0'(v_1) \right) du \\ &\qquad\qquad \left. - \int_{[v_1,t]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0\right) \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

By (the proof of) Lemma 7.20 of Doss and Wellner [2016b]

$$\sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{[v_1,t]} d\left(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0\right) \right| = \sqrt{\lambda(I)} O_p(n^{-2/5}).$$

The supremum over the middle term in (A.8) is $\lambda(I) O_p(n^{-2/5})$ by a Taylor expansion of f_0, and applying in addition Lemma 4.5 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], we see that the supremum over the first term in (A.8) is also $\lambda(I) O_p(n^{-2/5})$.

The same analysis, using Proposition 5.3 or Corollary 5.4 of Doss and Wellner [2016b], applies to $\sup_{t\in I} \left| \int_{[v_1,t]} d(\widehat{F}_n^0(u) - \mathbb{F}_n(u)) \right|$. Note in all cases that the random variables implicit in the O_p statements depend on I only through its length (and they are increasing in the length) and not the location of its endpoints, since $\|\sqrt{f_0}\| \leq f_0(m)$ and since $f_0^{(2)}$ is continuous and so uniformly bounded in a neighborhood of x_0. □

When we apply the previous lemma, the length of I will depend on ε which gives the probability bound implied by our o_p statements whereas its endpoints will depend on δ, which gives the size bound implied by our o_p statements.

Lemma A.5. *Let $\varepsilon(x)$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)$ be defined by $e^x = 1 + x + 2^{-1}x^2 e^{\varepsilon(x)}$ and $e^x = 1 + xe^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)}$. Then*

$$e^{\varepsilon(x)} \le 2e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)}. \tag{A.9}$$

Proof. We can see

$$e^{\varepsilon(x)} = \frac{e^x - 1 - x}{(x^2/2)} = \frac{2}{x^2}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{x^k}{k!} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{2x^k}{(k+2)!}.$$

Similarly,

$$e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)} = \frac{e^x - 1}{x} = \frac{1}{x}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^k}{k!} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{x^k}{(k+1)!}.$$

Comparing coeffients in the two series, we see that

$$\frac{2}{(k+2)!} \le \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \quad \text{for all } k \ge 0$$

since $k+2 \ge 2$ for $k \ge 0$. It follows that $e^{\varepsilon(x)} \le e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)}$ for all $x \ge 0$. This implies that $\varepsilon(x) \le \tilde{\varepsilon}(x)$ for all $x \ge 0$.

Now for $x \le 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)} - e^{\varepsilon(x)} &= \frac{2}{x}\left\{e^x - 1 - \frac{1}{x}(e^x - 1 - x)\right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{x}\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^k}{k!} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^k}{(k+1)!}\right\} = \frac{2}{x}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{k}{(k+1)!}x^k \end{aligned}$$

where the infinite sum is negative for all $x < 0$ since the first term is negative. It follows that

$$2e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)} - e^{\varepsilon(x)} \ge 0$$

for all $x \le 0$. Combined with the result for $x \ge 0$ the claimed result holds: $e^{\varepsilon(x)} \le 2e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(x)}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. □

References

Abraham, C., Biau, G. and Benoît, C. (2003). Simple estimation of the mode of a multivariate density. *Canad. J. Statist.* **31** 23–34. MR1985502 (2004c:62085)

Bahadur, R. R. and Savage, L. J. (1956). The nonexistence of certain statistical procedures in nonparametric problems. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **27** 1115–1122. MR0084241

Balabdaoui, F., Rufibach, K. and Wellner, J. A. (2009). Limit distribution theory for maximum likelihood estimation of a log-concave density. *The Annals of Statistics* **37** 1299–1331. MR2509075 (2010h:62290)

Banerjee, M. (2007). Likelihood based inference for monotone response models. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 931–956. . MR2341693 (2008h:62079)

Banerjee, M. and Wellner, J. A. (2001). Likelihood ratio tests for monotone functions. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 1699–1731. MR1891743 (2003c:62072)

Blum, J. R. and Rosenblatt, J. (1966). On some statistical problems requiring purely sequential sampling schemes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **18** 351–355. MR0205414

Cule, M. and Samworth, R. (2010). Theoretical properties of the log-concave maximum likelihood estimator of a multidimensional density. *Electron. J. Stat.* **4** 254–270. MR2645484 (2012f:62071)

Cule, M., Samworth, R. and Stewart, M. (2010). Maximum likelihood estimation of a multi-dimensional log-concave density. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **72** 545–607. MR2758237

Dharmadhikari, S. and Joag-Dev, K. (1988). *Unimodality, convexity, and applications. Probability and Mathematical Statistics*. Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA. MR954608 (89k:60020)

Donoho, D. L. (1988). One-sided inference about functionals of a density. *The Annals of Statistics* 1390–1420.

Donoho, D. L. and Liu, R. C. (1987). Geometrizing rates of convergence. I Technical Report No. 137, Dept. Statistics, Univ. Calif. Berkeley.

Donoho, D. L. and Liu, R. C. (1991). Geometrizing rates of convergence. II, III. *Ann. Statist.* **19** 633–667, 668–701. MR1105839

Doss, C. R. (2013a). logcondens.mode: Compute MLE of Log-Concave Density on R with Fixed Mode, and Perform Inference for the Mode. R package version 1.0.1. Available from http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=logcondens.mode.

Doss, C. R. (2013b). Shape-constrained inference for concave-transformed densities and their modes PhD thesis, University of Washington.

Doss, C. R. and Wellner, J. A. (2016a). Global Rates of Convergence of the MLEs of Log-concave and s-concave Densities. *Ann. Statist.* **44** 954–981. With supplementary material available online.

Doss, C. R. and Wellner, J. A. (2016b). Mode constrained estimation of a log-concave density Technical Report. arXiv:1611.10335.

Dümbgen, L. and Rufibach, K. (2009). Maximum likelihood estimation of a log-concave density and its distribution function: basic properties and uniform consistency. *Bernoulli* **15** 40–68. MR2546798

Dümbgen, L., Samworth, R. and Schuhmacher, D. (2011). Approximation by log-concave distributions, with applications to regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **39** 702–730.

Eddy, W. F. (1980). Optimum Kernel Estimators of the Mode. *The Annals of Statistics* **8** pp. 870-882.

Ehm, W. (1996). Adaptive kernel estimation of a cusp-shaped mode. In *Applied mathematics and parallel computing* 109–120. Physica, Heidelberg. MR1469264

Groeneboom, P., Jongbloed, G. and Wellner, J. A. (2001). A canonical process for estimation of convex functions: the "invelope" of integrated Brow-

nian motion $+t^4$. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 1620–1652. MR1891741 (2003c:62075)

Groeneboom, P. and Jongbloed, G. (2015). Nonparametric confidence intervals for monotone functions. *Ann. Statist.* **43** 2019–2054. . MR3375875

Hall, P. and Johnstone, I. (1992). Empirical functional and efficient smoothing parameter selection. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **54** 475–530. With discussion and a reply by the authors. MR1160479

Härdle, W., Marron, J. S. and Wand, M. P. (1990). Bandwidth choice for density derivatives. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **52** 223–232. MR1049312

Has'minskii, R. (1979). Lower bound for the risks of nonparametric estimates of the mode. *Contribution to Statistics: Jaroslav Hájek Memorial Volume* 91–97.

Hazelton, M. (1996a). Bandwidth selection for local density estimators. *Scand. J. Statist.* **23** 221–232. MR1394655

Hazelton, M. L. (1996b). Optimal rates for local bandwidth selection. *J. Nonparametr. Statist.* **7** 57–66. . MR1618191

Herrmann, E. and Ziegler, K. (2004). Rates of consistency for nonparametric estimation of the mode in absence of smoothness assumptions. *Statistics and Probability Letters* **68** 359 - 368.

Hoffleit, D. and Warren, W. H. Jr. (1991). *Bright Star Catalogue*. Yale University Observatory, New Haven. http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1995yCat.5050....0H.

Kim, J. (1994). Asymptotic theory for multi-dimensional mode estimator. *J. Korean Statist. Soc.* **23** 251–269. MR1327618

Kim, A. and Samworth, R. J. (2016). Global rates of convergence in log-concave density estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **44** to appear.

Klemelä, J. (2005). Adaptive estimation of the mode of a multivariate density. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.* **17** 83–105. MR2112688 (2005m:62090a)

Konakov, V. D. (1973). The asymptotic normality of the mode of multivariate distributions. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.* **18** 836–842. MR0336874 (49 ##1647)

Léger, C. and Romano, J. P. (1990). Bootstrap choice of tuning parameters. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **42** 709–735. . MR1089472

Mallows, C. L. (1972). A note on asymptotic joint normality. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **43** 508–515.

Mammen, E. and Park, B. U. (1997). Optimal smoothing in adaptive location estimation. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **58** 333–348. . MR1450020

Müller, H.-G. (1989). Adaptive nonparametric peak estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **17** 1053–1069. . MR1015137

Owen, A. B. (2001). *Empirical likelihood*. Chapman and Hall.

Pal, J. K., Woodroofe, M. and Meyer, M. (2007). Estimating a Polya frequency function$_2$. In *Complex datasets and inverse problems. IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.* **54** 239–249. Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH. MR2459192 (2010d:62087)

Parzen, E. (1962). On estimation of a probability density function and mode. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **33** 1065–1076. MR0143282 (26 ##841)

Pfanzagl, J. (1998). The nonexistence of confidence sets for discontinuous

functionals. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **75** 9–20. MR1671670

Pfanzagl, J. (2000). On local uniformity for estimators and confidence limits. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **84** 27–53. MR1747496

R Core Team, (2016). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Romano, J. P. (1988a). Bootstrapping the mode. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **40** 565–586. MR964293

Romano, J. P. (1988b). On weak convergence and optimality of kernel density estimates of the mode. *Ann. Statist.* **16** 629–647. MR947566 (90e:62056)

Rufibach, K. (2006). Log-concave density estimation and bump hunting for IID observations PhD thesis, Univ. Bern and Gottingen.

Sager, T. W. (1978). Estimation of a multivariate mode. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 802–812. MR491553 (80f:62046)

Samanta, M. (1973). Nonparametric estimation of the mode of a multivariate density. *South African Statist. J.* **7** 109–117. MR0331618 (48 ##9950)

Samworth, R. J. and Wand, M. P. (2010). Asymptotics and optimal bandwidth selection for highest density region estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **38** 1767–1792. . MR2662359

Sheather, S. J. and Jones, M. C. (1991). A reliable data-based bandwidth selection method for kernel density estimation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* **53** 683–690.

Silverman, B. W. (1986). *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*. Chapman & Hall, London.

Singh, R. (1963). Existence of bounded length confidence intervals. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **34** 1474–1485. MR0155394

Singh, R. (1968). Non-existence of estimates of prescribed accuracy in fixed sample size. *Canad. Math. Bull.* **11** 135–139. MR0232487

Tsybakov, A. B. (1990). Recursive estimation of the mode of a multidimensional distribution. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* **26** 38–45. MR1051586 (91j:62051)

Wellner, J. A. (2013). Strong Log-concavity is Preserved by Convolution. In *High Dimensional Probability VI* 95–102. Springer Basel, Basel.

Ziegler, K. (2001). On bootstrapping the mode in the nonparametric regression model with random design. *Metrika* **53** 141–170 (electronic). . MR1839003